

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in executive session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, July 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 6 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

IN THE NAVY PROMOTIONS

To be medical directors, with rank of rear admiral, for temporary service

Edward U. Reed, while serving as district medical officer, Third Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

George C. Thomas, while serving as district medical officer, Eleventh Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

William L. Mann, Jr., while serving as district medical officer, Thirteenth Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Joseph J. A. McMullen, while serving as district medical officer, Fifth Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Richard H. Laning, while serving as district medical officer, First Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Daniel Hunt, while serving as district medical officer, Twelfth Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

To be pay directors, with rank of rear admiral, for temporary service

Frank Baldwin, while serving as director of the Naval Cost Inspection Service, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Everett G. Morsell, while serving as district supply officer, Ninth Naval District, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Arthur H. Mayo, while serving as supply officer in command, naval supply depot, Oakland, Calif., to rank from June 25, 1943.

John J. Gaffney, while serving as district supply officer, Fourteenth Naval District and with additional duties as supply officer in command, naval supply depot, Pearl Harbor, and supply officer, navy yard, Pearl Harbor, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Malcolm G. Sillarow, while serving as supply officer in command, naval supply depot, Norfolk, Va., to rank from July 1, 1943.

To be civil engineers, with rank of rear admiral, for temporary service

Henry F. Bruns, while serving as superintending civil engineer of area VI and area VII, to rank from June 25, 1943.

James T. Mathews, while serving as superintending civil engineer of area IV, to rank from June 25, 1943.

John J. Manning, while serving as director, Atlantic Division, Bureau of Yards and Docks, to rank from June 25, 1943.

Carl H. Cotter, while serving as director, Pacific Division, Bureau of Yards and Docks, to rank from June 25, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Francis G. Rowland, Childersburg.
Nora W. Hill, Ramer.

ALASKA

Charles H. Hope, Unalaska.

ARKANSAS

Alonzo D. McAllister, Fayetteville.

ARIZONA

Eva L. Wheeler, Nogales.

CALIFORNIA

Lora Belle Fearheiley, Linden.
Alberta Frankamp, Novato.
Clarence C. Foulk, Pacoima.
Orin T. Howard, Santa Cruz.
June E. James, Robbins.
Adrian A. McMullen, Yuba City.

COLORADO

Frank H. Buskirk, Montrose.

CONNECTICUT

Fred E. Constantine, Lakeville.

FLORIDA

William T. Stephens, De Land.
Hilary F. Stewart, Fort Walton.

GEORGIA

Howard Thompson, Alma.

INDIANA

Chester Wagoner, Flora.
Donald Steinkamp, Holland.

IOWA

Milo Mochal, Traer.

KANSAS

Alvin W. Gerber, Fowler.
Logan N. Green, Garden City.
Florence T. Harbin, Irving.

MASSACHUSETTS

Alice M. Corey, Mattapoisett.

MINNESOTA

Gertrude S. Dyson, Becker.
Dorothy C. Tice, Mentor.
Bert H. Myhre, Dexter.
Viola A. Raduenz, Lucan.
Loretta M. Harper, Worthington.

MISSISSIPPI

Hugh A. Kennedy, Louln.

NORTH DAKOTA

Luella J. Hokanson, Fort Yates.
Arne M. Sletten, Souris.

OHIO

John B. Mannino, Erieside.

OKLAHOMA

J. C. Bennett, Jr., Tishomingo.

PENNSYLVANIA

John F. Peterson, Berwick.
Jerome E. Southerton, Honesdale.
William M. Rees, Linwood.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul H. Wilkes, Chester.
Inez C. Wilson, Williamston.

TENNESSEE

Elsie M. Johnson, Sewanee.

TEXAS

Leander J. Scrivener, Eagle Pass.
Arley T. McCarron, Ferris.
Jack P. Molloy, Uvalde.

VERMONT

Herbert B. Butler, St. Albans.

VIRGINIA

Louise L. Smith, Greenway.
Maude V. Mills, Lynnhaven.
John E. Milan, Norfolk.

WISCONSIN

Frederick Walter Anderson, Hawkins.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 6, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Reverend Michael Enright, of Carrollton, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O God, King of Kings and Lord of governments, by whom rulers rule, and from whom earthly power comes, mercifully behold our President, Congress—all in authority. Infuse into them the spirit of Thy divine wisdom, clemency, and justice. Instill Thy spirit into all civil institutions, into every form of government, into laws and armies. May all the powers on earth recognize the majesty of the Eternal God.

May we, citizens, be ever conscious and worthy of the abundant life, the riches, spiritual and economic, we enjoy in this great land.

Through Christ our Lord we pray.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1316. An act to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America.

BAN ON DRIVING TO SUMMER HOME LIFTED

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a recent O. P. A. order lifting the ban to trips to summer homes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, about 3 weeks ago, the 135 Representatives and 24 Senators from the eastern seaboard States decided upon collective action in an endeavor to provide relief for the critical petroleum shortage on the eastern seaboard.

We pooled our ideas and proposed a program which, if carried out, will do much to alleviate the hardship and distress facing our constituency. As chairman of the Eastern States Conference, I am pleased to announce to the House today that we have won a concession which I am sure will be welcomed by everyone on the eastern seaboard.

I am authorized by the Office of Price Administration to announce that the ban on driving to one's summer home or

vacation place has been lifted. The rationing officials under direction of Price Administrator Prentiss Brown, have agreed to permit one trip to one's vacation destination and return home. This will apply not only to a summer home owner, but will also include those who rent summer homes, or who will spend their vacations at a hotel, camp, rooming house, and so forth.

The trip may be for a weekend, a week, or a month. The holder of A gas rationing coupons will merely pay a visit to his local rationing board, fill out a form stating the date he is to leave for his summer place, and the date of his return. He will then be given a permit to make that trip. This order will be effective on July 15.

I urge my colleagues on the eastern seaboard to make it known to their constituents that these applications from their local boards will not be available until July 15. Our constituents should also be apprised of the fact that an abuse of this concession may result in the elimination of A coupons completely.

The Eastern Conference has contended that because our people had saved their A coupons for this very purpose, that no additional gas should be needed. We hope that our contentions will be proved to be correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The only trouble with this is that it comes too late. The children should have had this opportunity when they came out of school.

Mr. HARTLEY. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent, but I think we have done a good job in getting them to make the decision at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Mr. Sterling Morton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE LATE WLADYSLAW SIKORSKI

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the untimely and tragic death of General Wladyslaw Sikorski has brought sorrow to liberty-loving people throughout all the world, and I personally am deeply grieved at his passing.

General Sikorski had gained worldwide renown as a diplomat of unusual attainments, as a military strategist of the highest order, and as possessing those humane qualities which all of us respect and admire.

His intense devotion to the interests of his native Poland, and his broad concepts of the principles of freedom and democracy for all peoples of the world stood out as a beacon light in this now stricken world.

At his appearances before the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, he impressed each and every one of us who were privileged to discuss with him in executive session both the military situation and the problems of the coming peace as one who was destined to play an important part in the world that is to come.

When the time comes for the making of the peace, the advice, the influence, and the aid of General Sikorski will be sadly missed.

Again I say, the world regrets his untimely death.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include the Charter Day address delivered by Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, at the University of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a news release on the development of electricity at Fort Peck in Montana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BULWINKLE asked, and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Connecticut addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, on the subject of food subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a radio interview of the other evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a recent order from the Navy Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement with reference to the iron and steel shortage existing throughout the country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement of Mr. O. C. Bailey, chairman of the Arkansas Oil and Gas Commission, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial-Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PREMIUMS ON LIFE-INSURANCE POLICIES

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to H. R. 2541, which I have introduced, to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of certain amounts paid as life-insurance premiums. Hundreds of thousands of policyholders out of the 67,000,000 throughout the country are already faced with such necessity for curtailing expenses that many life-insurance policies will become lapsed through failure to keep up the premiums.

The bill is anti-inflationary. All life-insurance companies are now investing practically all new moneys in Government bonds.

It will promote victory by encouraging the purchase of War bonds; furthermore, it will save many War bonds currently held in the hands of the purchasers because many holders will be facing the question of whether to sacrifice some of the insurance equities they have been building up or to sell some of their bonds in order to keep up their insurance premiums.

It is not a rich man's bill, because \$1,000 is the largest deduction which may be taken; it is distinctly in the interests of the great middle class of citizens whose income has not been increased but whose expenses have soared by leaps and bounds.

This proposal has been enthusiastically received by many individuals who have been haunted by the fear that their thrift in building up an insurance program to insure reserves for their old age or the protection of their dependents in case of death is now to be penalized by their inability to carry on the program and at the same time to meet other obligations.

The buying and holding of life insurance for the protection of families and dependents has been one of the stabilizing influences of American life, and a wholesale cancellation of such insurance in this perilous period of our national economy would be correspondingly disastrous.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Daily Independent of Murphysboro, Ill., of July 3, 1943, entitled "Let Freedom Ring."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, as one Republican I wish to be recorded as being opposed to a recess at this time. The

American people elected the Congress to do a job that must be done if we are to win the war, and we should stay on the job.

In the midst of this all-out effort to win the war and with the damnable mess existing here in Washington with petty personalities, discriminations, bickering, and wrangling among the high places in the administration forces who are conducting the fight on the home front, and bypassing of the Congress in an effort to regiment the people of America into a socialistic program of administrative democracy; in their efforts to indoctrinate into our economic life the philosophy of "production for use and not for profit," from producer to consumer, to eliminate the middleman and small businessman, a situation has developed which may ultimately prolong the war at the cost of thousands of American lives—and suddenly the Congress decides to recess and leave this critical situation in the hands of a group such as we have in the O. P. A. who haven't the slightest conception of what it is all about.

When we offer an amendment to put practical men in to operate these departments, the Senate knocks it out.

As one Republican, I wish to be recorded that I am of the opinion that the Congress should stay on the job while there is work to do, and there is plenty to do to restore order out of the chaotic situation in the various departments of the Government.

It would be nice for the boys on Guadalcanal, in north Africa, in the Solomon Islands, on the seas, under the seas, on land and in the air to also decide they would like a recess, let the war go, it is too hot, let us go home.

I believe it is our duty and responsibility to make our contribution to this war effort here in Washington. Bureaucracy is anxious for us to get out of Washington. However, I am of the opinion, here is where we belong to bolster up the home front in an efficient and orderly manner to produce the materials to support these boys who in the springtime of their lives are making the fight to preserve our constitutional rights and our Republic.

THE CORN SITUATION

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I know there are many Members of the House who are interested in finding some solution for the corn situation, which is growing more critical every hour. I do not believe we ought to adjourn without some further effort being made to solve that problem. I have conferred with a number of Members on both sides of the aisle and they have agreed that we ought to have a conference at the earliest possible moment on this subject. There will be a conference to consider this question at the committee room of the House Committee on Agriculture tomorrow

morning at 10 o'clock. I hope everyone interested will be present.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain letters relative to the subsidy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three separate subjects and to include certain excerpts in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program today and following any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, and I give warning that I am going to talk about politics.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may talk about politics for 15 minutes later today.

There was no objection.

THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for two purposes. First, I want to emphasize the statement made by my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], with reference to the corn situation. Further, I wish to make this statement. Most of you know that some time ago our distinguished minority leader appointed a food study committee from among the Republican membership. I chance to be the chairman of that committee. Our committee is not quite ready to make a formal report to the House with reference to our activity, but I have just been granted permission to place in the RECORD a speech which I have prepared on the food question. In that speech I hope to cover all phases of the subject. I hope to supply figures and facts that I hope will be interesting and instructive. The food situation is very serious, and it is unfortunate that nobody can see any improvement. All indications are that the food situation is going to get worse. The President's refusal to place the whole food situation in the hands of one Food Administrator was a mistake. The failure of distribution of food is even worse than the failure to produce food.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a copy of a petition signed by a number of people in Sacramento, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOWELL was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a lengthy letter from the secretary-treasurer of the Louisiana Cattlemen's Association with reference to the shortage of corn and the livestock situation in the Southwest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sun, of June 8, 1943, extolling Frank E. Gannett because of the fact that he purchased another paper in that town, which contributes materially to the conditions that now exist.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the legislative business and the expiration of any other special orders, I may have 10 minutes tonight to talk about corn, petroleum, WALLACE, Jones, and kindred matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Congress fixed up the silver business. That is not the only thing that should be done before we go home, if we do go home at all. There is the corn situation which needs attention. If we can buy 35-cent silver at 71 cents, there should not be any reason why the department should hold down the price of corn so that it is kept off the market, especially when it is needed to grow cattle, about the scarcity of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] complains about so much.

Then there is another thing which should receive our attention before we go home, if we do go home. Yesterday morning's Post contained an editorial, and last night's Star another, about this man Petrillo, who intends to deprive all of us; yes, even our men in camps and across the sea, of all recorded music. We ought to take care of him before we go home. I introduced a bill a year ago, the 27th of this month, which would remedy the trouble. It is over in the Judiciary Committee, but they do not give me a hearing on it. It would prevent that man stopping the recording and transmission of song or instrumental music.

Why should he shut us off? If anybody knows any reason, I would like to have it. If anyone knows of any reason why we should not act on legislation which will end the evil, let us have it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Lawrence Sullivan, from the current issue of the Nation's Business, entitled "Where Price Control Got Off the Beam."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a speech by our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORN FOR DAIRY AND POULTRY FEED

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Agriculture yesterday passed a bill raising the price of corn to \$1.40 a bushel, or taking the ceiling off entirely. I hope that will be acted upon by the Senate and come over here before we recess, possibly tomorrow. If something of that kind is not done, I certainly, and I believe a great many other Members of the House, will vote against adjourning or taking a lengthy recess. We have a definite duty to perform—a duty to legislate—and we have no right to go home and leave these farmers in the East and the South, and even in the States of Ohio and Indiana without corn for their poultry and for their dairy herds. The situation is a desperate one. We cannot afford to go home for 2 months and ignore that situation or wash our hands of it. If we do, the eastern farmers will have to destroy their herds and their poultry, decrease food production, and contribute to a famine in our own country next winter.

I, for one, propose to vote against adjournment or a long recess unless some legislation of this kind is enacted into law before we leave Washington.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE NATIONAL WEALTH

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders and the legislative program today I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Ickes in an illuminating article in the American Magazine figures the total

wealth of the United States at \$12,023,000,000,000. The American Magazine in a foreword accompanying the article says Secretary Ickes put his statisticians to work so he could arrive at the above figure.

Ickes does a little dividing by 135,000,000 people and figures that we are all worth \$87,000 apiece.

Some commentators have criticized Ickes for using the Government pay roll to make the calculation of wealth. I am quite satisfied to take Mr. Ickes' word that he made the calculations himself on his daily meander in his Government limousine between the Interior penthouse and the chicken farm and make the tart comment that he has some rationing cards. I know he does not have any car pool, because he needs more room than six people in a crowded limousine would provide.

Mr. Ickes invites anyone to challenge his figures. I do not have the staff to challenge the figures and do not have the gas card to do the figuring, but I am a little skeptical of New Dealers dividing the wealth of the country. I know I cannot bank the \$87,000, so I will not worry about that.

I wish to point out, though, that the Indians had more natural resources on the right-hand side of the ledger than we have. They probably could figure a higher dollar personal worth when the first white man landed on these shores than we can today. Look what happened to the Indians. Ickes is their guardian, and if he is putting these figures down, getting ready to be my guardian, I object.

I do not want to challenge Secretary Ickes' figures because I learned long ago that you cannot get an answer to Broadway arithmetic or Pennsylvania Avenue arithmetic. Broadway arithmetic, you know, is a chorus girl's salary, \$20 a week; Park Avenue residence, \$400 a month; a limousine, and an ermine coat.

President Roosevelt in an address to the small businessman's conference in Washington a couple of years ago said, "Don't worry about the national debt. We owe it to each other." But you cannot pay off the H. O. L. C. or the butcher with it.

I do not want to get into the contest; I just do not want to end up a ward of the Secretary's or try to get any answer to Broadway or Pennsylvania Avenue arithmetic.

RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

AN INSPIRING EXAMPLE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I feel that we need a little inspiration to bring our determination back again. I saw an article in one of the local papers, mentioning the fact that one of our men in the service was engaged at a high altitude in a dog fight in the South Pacific; there were a number of planes engaged in the fight; his plane was hit and caught fire. The young man had to bail out. He was very badly burned. He dropped for some time before pulling the cord to open his parachute. When the chute opened he made all kinds of faces at those in the enemy planes to make it appear that he was a Japanese. He was suffering from intense pain from his burns; he took out his medicine kit and used morphine to deaden the pain caused by his burns. He landed in the ocean. Then he took time to inflate his rubber raft, climbed in, pulled his parachute over him and went to sleep. He was picked up later and taken to the hospital. He recovered and he is now back in the dog fight for his country.

What an example of courage, sacrifice, and heroism in contrast to the conduct of those in high places who bicker and quarrel and play politics in this time of national danger.

CONGRESSMAN PAUL BROWN

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago on yesterday my colleague the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. PAUL BROWN, was first elected as a Member of this body. During the ensuing 10 years he has never missed a roll call; he has never missed a meeting of his committee; he has been faithful to his duties to which the people elected him, and I wish to extend my congratulations to him for his splendid service here and for the outstanding record he has made in his faithful attendance upon the sessions of this body.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. We welcome him to this little group.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

CORN PRICES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in the comments made here with reference to the corn program. If it is the plan of this body to start tearing down the O. P. A. by passing laws raising the price of individual items selected from time

to time, whether it be corn today or beans the next week or something else the next, I can assure my colleagues that we are going to have some legislative trouble in this country. I do not believe in any such stuff. I shall not support any such program. Why does this Congress believe it can successfully legislate individual commodity prices?

If I am long on corn and short on cash I generally sell corn. If I am long on cash and short on corn what right have I to go to the man who has corn and make him sell his corn against his desire to hold? If I can make more money out of corn by feeding the corn to hogs and placing them on the market, why should you want to make me sell the corn so that a neighbor or some stranger who has no corn and wants corn to feed his poultry, so he can make a profit, by buying it. Why should I have to sell my own corn to someone who can use it and make a profit, when I am not allowed to keep it and make a profit by feeding and thus supply meat instead of corn?

I do not own any corn but I think I have practical sense enough to appreciate some of the problems involved in this matter, as between the fellow who has corn he wants to feed to his own livestock, the fellow who holds corn and will not sell it, and the fellow who wants to make a profit out of the corn which he hopes to buy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to be able to attend the conference to be held tomorrow and will be glad to hear some of the views that are expressed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Carl A. Gray, in the June issue of the Connecticut Industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

ADVERTISING OF THE UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, since I talked last Tuesday on the excess wages paid in war industries I have been receiving many letters, a great number of which contained advertisements for help

in war industries. I wish to read from one of the advertisements I received from Alameda, Calif., which are typical. These are ads signed by the United States Employment Service. One ad read:

Moore Dry Dock needs women, 18 to 40 years of age.

It pictures a beautiful looking young lady who says:

I started at \$214 per month, and I am now earning \$270 a month.

Another young woman in another advertisement says:

We are paid at least \$214 a month while we learn to weld, and soon earn over \$270 a month as a journeyman. Ten percent extra for swing shift; 15 percent extra for graveyard shift.

The ad is also signed by the United States Employment Service and advertises for help for the shipyards of California.

It continues:

You can do what Louise Meisner is doing. We'll train you to weld and pay you at the rate of \$214 a month during the short training period. Soon you'll be equipped with the knowledge that will win you promotions to pay \$270 a month.

The ad is signed "U. S. Employment Service," and then we talk of inflation. The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and also on another topic.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PHALANGE: THE AXIS SECRET ARMY IN THE AMERICAS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PAYMENT OF EXPENSES FOR CLERICAL PHALANGE: THE AXIS SECRET ARMY IN POSTAL STATIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH].

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1316) to provide for clerical assistance at post

offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. This bill is to permit not to exceed \$2.50 a day to be paid for the actual expenses of postal employees designated to work in postal stations in Army camps and naval stations.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is to pay only expenses?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARTLEY. And if the gentleman will yield, it was reported out, I understand, unanimously by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. It was.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, whenever deemed necessary in serving military and naval personnel at military and naval camps, posts, or stations, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to detail any postal employee from main post offices to postal units, at such camps, posts, or stations, without changing the official station of such postal employee, and to authorize allowances, not exceeding \$2.50 per day in lieu of actual expenses, while so detailed, without regard to the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, such allowances to be paid from the appropriation "Miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices."

Sec. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit for any payments heretofore made not exceeding the allowances herein provided, to the employees so detailed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The bells will be rung at 10 minutes to 2 and the House will resume its session at 2 o'clock. The Chair declares the House in recess until 2 o'clock.

Thereupon at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m. the House stood in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1318. An act authorizing the appointment of additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

JULY 6, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RAYBURN: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the following committees: World War Veterans' Legislation, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Road, and Patents.

My resignation to be effective as of today.

Sincerely yours,

JOE B. BATES.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 291), which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Rules, JOE B. BATES, Kentucky; Agriculture, E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of all previous special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the conference reports on the war agencies bill and the last deficiency bill will not be ready before 5 o'clock or perhaps a little bit later. Therefore the Chair thinks it might be well to proceed with the special orders. If a conference report comes in, we will take it up immediately.

Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in the last few months much has been said by certain Members of this House in reference to rationing and there has been considerable talk about nationalities and minority groups. This is not the time or place to criticize or attack any racial groups, nor is it for the Congress to set an example in that kind of procedure. I regret to say that has been done. The Congress must set an example for unity of all the people and if there is disturbance, it is our duty to determine the facts and to see that the

culprits are punished properly, wherever that disturbance may be. So much for that.

A year ago I came before this honorable body and appealed to it to give the Committee on Immigration the right to study certain important problems regarding aliens in this country. A minority group in the House, unalterably opposed to anything reported by the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, was able to convince this body not to comply with our committee's request, and as a result of that action we are now at a loss to determine just what to do with certain aliens in this country. On the other hand, since last January you have passed without any question about 8 or 10 resolutions giving various committees the power to study certain problems. You have appropriated hundreds of thousands of dollars for those committees. In fact, we have so many committees now I do not think we have room for them.

When asking for the resolution I mentioned before, the committee was trying to protect the best interests of the country. The resolution had to do with alien enemies in this country. To illustrate, we have at Ellis Island, only one of the ports, 250 Chinese who have technically deserted. They are alien seamen. Why did they desert? Because certain shipping companies exploited them by low wages and miserable treatment. After they worked for many, many months and got shore leave they could not even get enough money to feed themselves. The public had to do it. The Allied shipping companies, including the British and other countries' steamship companies, have kept these Chinese working 20 or more hours a day. When they got to this country and received a little shore leave, and when they were supposed to receive four or five hundred dollars which was due them to send to their people to buy rice and food, they got only \$5 or \$10.

These are troublesome problems that the committee was hoping to go into. We have two-hundred-some-odd Nazis at Ellis Island, and that is only one of the many ports in this country. In my opinion, some of them ought not to be allowed to stay there. They receive treatment as if they were in a clubhouse, getting three square meals a day, and lazying around. They are definitely un-American. They have no business at Ellis Island. They should be removed to some other place. Yet we could not go into that because the Congress a year ago said we had no right to study all these questions.

On top of that, Fritz Kuhn has now been released from prison after serving 2½ years. He is the leader of the German-American Bund, Mr. Hitler's friend. He organized all the Nazi sympathizers in this country into Fascist groups to help Hitler. He is now detained at Ellis Island. Why? Why should he not be put some place where he would not be able to contaminate other doubtful internees—as we have in Ellis Island?

We find that our prisoners of war are getting a pretty raw deal in Japan and Germany. Do you know that over 300

or 400 of our soldiers died in Japanese prisons of disease and lack of food and medicine? Do you know that they are dying by the hundreds, that our men who are prisoners of war are being treated worse than cattle, and that American soldiers in the concentration camps in Germany today are dying by the dozens every day? Let me insert two newspaper reports as to the treatment some of our boys received in Japan:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 26, 1943]

PRIEST TELLS HOW JAPS SLEW DOOLITTLE AIDES

ST. LOUIS, May 25.—The Japanese who wreaked vengeance on Chinese and missionaries for aiding Brig. Gen. Jimmy Doolittle's American flyers after the Tokyo raid stopped only at cannibalism, the Reverend George Yager, American missionary who was there, said today.

Father Yager, serving the Congregation of Missions at Yu Kiang, Kiangsi, near which some of the Doolittle flyers landed after their historic bombing, told of the murder, torture, and mayhem which followed the Japs' discovery that Catholic missionaries and Chinese residents of Kiangsi had sheltered the stranded flyers and helped them escape.

As the Japanese descended upon the area, Father Yager said, Bishop Charles Quinn, of Los Angeles, 8 American priests, and 5 nuns retreated into the hills some 20 miles away with 300 Chinese. They left behind Fr. Humbert Verdini, Italian Vincentian priest, who had volunteered to remain in an effort to protect the old, the very young, and the sick.

"With the withdrawal of the Japanese," Father Yager said, "the bishop and the priests moved back into their former missions, and found nothing but destruction and isolation confronting them. Towns were completely laid waste. The whole countryside reeked of death in every form. Poor country people who had stayed on, hoping to be allowed to continue to work their fields, had been savagely tortured and put to death."

FATHER VERDINI MISSING

"From some of the villagers who had managed to escape death we heard stories far too brutal and savage to relate. Just one charge was not heard—cannibalism. But outside of that, take your choice and you can't miss the savage nature of the Japanese Army."

Bishop Quinn found his Yukiang home burned. He searched for Father Verdini and discovered only his sun helmet and a muddled jacket beside a pond in the rear of the compound, which was lined with human bones. Father Verdini never has been found.

"We know the 60 or so children and old people in the residence with him were killed by the Japs," Father Yager said. "The bestiality of the action cannot be imagined by civilized peoples."

A 70-year-old French priest was beaten and stabbed and later died. A Chinese priest was beheaded. Property loss in churches and homes of the American missionaries reached "well over \$1,000,000," Father Yager estimated.

The Japs particularly were eager to find Father Dunker, Dutch priest who had brought the wounded Lt. (now Capt.) Harold F. Watson and his crew 40 miles across mountain country to be treated by a Dr. Homberger, German-Jewish doctor working in a hospital operated by the Irish Columban fathers.

GERMAN DOCTOR MALTREATED

"The doctor, who stayed on with his German passport, was subjected to rough treatment as a result of his treatment of Lieutenant Watson," Father Yager said. "The

hospital in which the doctor practiced under the care of the Irish missionaries was burned along with the town."

"Doolittle and his crew, who landed near Shang-Yu, were anxious to proceed immediately to Chungking," Father Yager said, "but the injured Watson and his crew stayed a few days with Father Dunker. Some of the flyers also were assisted by Father William Glynn, of Chicago."

"The flyers, with Doolittle in command, arrived at Ying-Tan about 7:30 a. m.," Father Yager said. "They spent about an hour eating breakfast, then got on busses for their next lap toward Chungking. About 40 minutes later three Jap planes came out of Nanchang and flew down the road after the busses."

"Fortunately, they were too late, but they did manage to bomb a mail truck and kill three Chinese."

[From the New York Daily Mirror of June 22, 1943]

DEAD IN JAP PRISON CAMPS PUT AT 300

WASHINGTON, June 21.—Disease and malnutrition have killed 300 Americans in Jap prison camps since the fall of Bataan and Corregidor, the War Department disclosed tonight.

The announcement was based on reports received through the International Red Cross. Chief causes of death, in addition to beriberi, a disease of malnutrition, were malaria, diphtheria, dysentery and pneumonia. Previously the Japs had reported 300 deaths due to battle wounds.

The deaths occurred among a total of 11,307 Army personnel thus far reported as prisoners of war.

The War Department had no comment on whether the mortality rate was exceptionally high and whether it indicated mistreatment or neglect.

The diseases listed ordinarily result from lack of proper food, sanitation, medical care and shelter.

We find that we are bringing over here captured prisoners from Germany and Japan. We set up a very fine camp for them at Huntsville, Tex. They are not only permitted to have their recreation and play baseball and probably see some movies but they are also taken care of medically. We treat them royally. Yet our boys are dying from the treatment that is being accorded them by the Japanese and German Governments.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that these are the things I should like to know more about and that the Congress should know more about and the public should know more about. I hope to appear again before the Committee on Rules. I ask this House for unity, all of you, to give us the right to study these questions, not only those I have illustrated here but many more which should be looked into.

We ought to have the right to segregate the good alien from the bad alien. We have them all bunched together now. One is tripping over the other. There are a number of so-called enemy aliens in this country today. The term "enemy alien" takes in men who are pro-ally, who are willing to fight and die for this country, but unfortunately the present interpretation of this classification is such that we will not take these men because we call them and treat them like real enemies. What a waste of manpower in crucial times like these. All these problems are important and should be examined and determined by some committee that can come back to this

House after the recess and submit to this House a constructive program to deal with them for the best interests of our country and for the preservation of our democracy.

There are many Nazis in this country who have become naturalized and we ought to find a short cut to denaturalize them. Under the present process it is impossible to do it fast enough. My committee reported legislation to this Congress to do that very thing, but it seems that the moment we bring up an Immigration Committee bill there is always some opposition in one corner or the other and claims that we are seeking to open the doors of the country. The discussion has usually nothing to do with the merits of the bill and the decision cast without even taking up the provisions of the bill.

My only purpose in appealing to you for unity is to ask for fairness in respect to ourselves and to the citizens of our country. In times when the armed forces and industry need all the manpower and skill obtainable we have no right to disregard an important source for both just because of some old prejudices. There are innumerable highly trained and skilled people who are lost to our war effort because they are unfortunately and incorrectly labeled enemy aliens. We owe it to our fighting men to devise some method to get at this untapped resource of manpower. It is our duty to find some way to utilize people who can be of help to us in our fierce struggle. On the other hand it would seem to me that the several hundred Nazis at Ellis Island should not stay there. I personally would not wait very long, I would send them to a place where they would be far away from any strategic area and from contact with possible accomplices still at large. I would isolate them and not allow them to contaminate other people who visit that island. They are dangerous people. Some of them are citizens. They had no business becoming citizens.

The committee was also hoping to get that authority we asked for a year ago, because there are thousands of Nazis and Japanese who hold dual nationality. They are citizens of several countries. They work with us one day and work against us the next day, but in working against us they have been working behind our back. They are too clever and therefore the more dangerous—to be too obvious.

So, without trying to split any hairs with any Member of this House, we are going in the very near future to present another resolution. It would require hardly any money. We would not ask for \$50,000 or \$100,000 or \$650,000. It would take just a few thousand dollars to make that study which is necessary to promulgate a program of legislation for the best interests of our country.

MR. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

MR. HOFFMAN. The gentleman expressed the hope that Members would not bring up the racial question, did he not?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I said that; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know of anyone who has spoken more frequently or at greater length on racial questions than himself?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In my discussions of racial questions I was only appealing for unity. I never attacked any racial group. I only mentioned the subject matter when I felt—in all fairness to our democratic ideals and principles—that I should speak up for any racial group attacked by others. It is true, I have appealed to Congress, time and again, to act against discrimination and intolerance, to act against inhuman treatment of minority groups. I have never injected any racial issue in any other way. The gentleman cannot point out to me one instance in my 22 years as a Member of this honorable body that I have ever attacked anyone because of race, creed, or color. He will not be able to point out one instance where I brought up the question of race or creed unless it was to protect someone against unfair discrimination or attacks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No effort was being made by me to criticize anything the gentleman said today or at any other time, but in view of what the gentleman said, does he know of any Member of the House who has attempted to stir up racial feeling from the Well of the House?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I would hate to stand here and give a bill of particulars. It would take an awful lot of pages to give you a bill of particulars and it would probably start a lot of unnecessary heated arguments. You know what I am referring to and the statements printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will bear me out. I do not want to cross swords with anybody here and I stand here in the most friendly spirit appealing to the Members of Congress who represent the American people to set an example for the people of this great country by using reason instead of emotion in dealing with legislation, by trying to keep our composure in these trying times, and prevent intolerance and discrimination from gaining a foothold in our beloved country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Everyone will agree with that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If you go back to the records of a week ago, 2 weeks ago, and 3 weeks ago, I could show you where we have not lived up to our principles. It is not necessary for one Member to make personal attacks upon a colleague—as has been the case quite often lately. We are all here for one purpose. We all represent the interests of our constituencies. We must work together for whatever differences may exist in our constituencies. We all have one all-absorbing interest in common now and that is to win the war as speedily as possible and without sacrificing any of the principles for which we are fighting. I know that everyone is trying to do his best. But we in Congress must always keep in mind that our actions as individuals are also interpreted as the actions of the representatives of the American people. We must be united if we want to show that the American people are united. We must show that there

is no race hatred or intolerance or discrimination here if we want the world to believe that the United States and the American people do not believe in such vicious doctrines. It is true, very often I have stood in the well of this House and appealed to you, telling you what has happened to the Jews in Poland and other parts of the world, who are being slaughtered by the hundreds of thousands, and have asked the Congress and the American people to do something for those people. Yes, I plead guilty of having asked your help for the unfortunate Jews who are being systematically exterminated by Hitler's gangsters.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the Jews are not the only ones who are suffering in this war, by any means. We are all in it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I admit that. But can you name any other group who has been tortured as much as the Jews have been by the Nazis?

Mr. HOFFMAN. When you said you were appealing to all of us, you included yourself in that?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; certainly. I am not exempting myself at any time.

I have not only appealed in behalf of the Jews, but of all persecuted people no matter where they may be. What have we accomplished at the so-called Bermuda conference? We talk about trying to help the innocent victims of Nazi aggression. We have not made one constructive suggestion to rescue the tortured victims of Nazi wrath, whether they be Jew, Catholic, or Protestant.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are we not fighting this war and are not American lives being sacrificed by the thousands for the very purpose that the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We are fighting for our own country and for our democracy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Our democracy?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. American democracy. We are fighting for principles. We are fighting for a cause. The people in this war are asking themselves the question, "What are we fighting for?" when they hear about race riots taking place in their own country. They are supposed to be fighting against the principles of fascism and nazism and then they hear about people in our own country expounding the very same ideas and ideals they are fighting against.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, well, now, I would like to get on.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right, then.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. To me, Mr. Speaker, there is only one answer, and the answer is tolerance. You may be right, I may be wrong, but why not discuss it like mature human beings? Why can we not sit down around the conference table and discuss problems as they arise—discuss them logically and rationally—without getting personalities involved?

As an illustration, there is a great clamor for the repeal of the Chinese ex-

clusion law—a tremendous appeal from a great number of the American people, from every walk of life. The cold facts are that not more than 107 Chinese could come into this country annually if China were put on a quota basis. There is no foundation for some statements made on this floor to the effect that we are going to open the doors and let all the coolie labor come in. Some Members on that side and on this side believed that was true. They were trying to stop consideration of the legislation to repeal the Chinese exclusion act by saying that such repeal would flood the country with Chinese coolie labor. What the proponents of this legislation have tried to do is to give China some moral support—to help her against the Japanese propaganda trying to divide and disunite her people. We have been realistic in our approach instead of taking the superior attitude that we can lick any enemy alone. We must have China as our ally to be able to defeat Japan. If we lose China's confidence or if China is conquered from within we may have to fight a costly, bloody war in the Pacific all alone for the next 10 or 15 years. China is ready to fight this war without our sending a single American boy into China if we will just give her the material and leadership. We will not have to sacrifice so many American soldiers if we will do all in our power to keep China in the war and fighting on our side. As I stated before, Japanese propaganda is as potent as Japanese guns and anything we can do to counteract it is of vast military importance.

So I say to you, what I did in asking for the repeal of the exclusion act was motivated by the desire to help my country to keep China in this war. Any statement made to the effect that I was trying to break down our immigration bars is not true and not based on facts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WILSON was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

POLITICS AND THE WAR

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I made the announcement that I was going to talk about politics. Partly that remains true. My desire to take this time arises on account of the feeling that I have that we yet have before us a long, hard war. As I am able to analyze or appraise the present situation, we, the Allies, are just beginning to take the offensive in this great struggle. While I would not minimize in the least the wonders that have

been accomplished up to this time in launching this offensive action, I confess to you that I am unable to see the chance of anything like an early conclusion of this great conflict. Feeling this way, I am greatly disturbed, and while it may seem to be in a measure by way of an indictment against some, I feel every day that too many of us—and I speak particularly now of Members of Congress—too many of us are prone to paramount things which, compared with this great struggle going on in the world, are of little consequence.

Notwithstanding the fact that we yet have before us in all probability a long, hard war; it does not disturb me much that that might mean some privations to me or to you, but it does disturb me when I remember that our own boys and our own men are surrendering willingly their lives upon the battlefields of the world that we may continue in the blessings of liberty and the freedoms which were purchased by the blood of those who went before us.

PATRIOTISM, NOT POLITICS

I am strongly impressed with the idea and, indeed, the conviction that I am not sufficiently mindful at all times of the duty I owe to the men in arms, who are fighting for freedom and the preservation of our country. In this war thousands of our men—largely our young men, perhaps—have already given their lives for this cause. I am not unmindful of the fact—not merely the expectation—that thousands of others of our fellow citizens will die for my freedom and yours. How many shall die depends in a large measure upon how faithful I am to my duty and my obligation as a citizen and a recipient of the blessings that will flow from the sacrifices made by my fellow Americans who are standing between me and the loss of my country and my freedom. Through their bravery and sacrifices I shall be free and not slave.

It is not enough that I shall vote for appropriations of money to carry on the war. I must refrain from all acts and avoid all words that would in the least tend to divide those who are engaged in this great battle for freedom. I must not only profess to be, but be, thankful for the allies who are aiding us in this titanic struggle, which, if gained, will assure our enjoyment of the blessings of liberty, but, if lost, will leave us without hope for ourselves or our posterity for centuries to come. I must know that even one word which tends to divide and, consequently, to hinder will result in the loss of a life, or many lives—the lives of those who gallantly defend us. I may fail; I can fail to hold highest my obligation to my country, placing party or other considerations above my loyalty to my country and to the men who bear the toil and heat of the day. If I do this, I shall have brought upon myself the contempt of all my fellows, and particularly of those who are on the battlefields of the world for my security. I must avoid divisions at home. If by action or inaction, word or failure to speak when I ought to speak, I prolong this struggle for liberty 1 minute, I cannot say that

I am not guilty of at least allowing some mother's boy to die unnecessarily. This is not a fanciful or an imaginary contemplation. It is truth; it is an everlasting truth.

Let us reason together. What is above our duty to do all we can to secure the peace of the world in the shortest possible time and at the same time make the peace a lasting one? Let us be reminded of the implications of our present struggle. I quote from Archbishop Stritch in his survey of the peace pronouncements of Pope Pius XII in respect to the great things involved in the struggle for the peace and freedom to which we must dedicate ourselves:

This time we must make a peace that will give lasting security to all nations and all peoples. It is hard to contemplate what would be the consequences of a failure at the peace table when victory comes. Despite all efforts to preserve peace, the Nazi Party went to war. It did not conceal its objective of setting up by force a new world order, in which a single nation would dominate and the other nations would be mere tributaries to its wealth and power. Let any student, in full calmness and impartiality, examine the proposal of the Axis and study the philosophy which inspires it, and he will be compelled to conclude that it holds no promise of world peace.

Archbishop Stritch then reminds of the pronouncements set forth in the "four freedoms," and refers to this as the language of honest peacemakers.

History—

He says—

has bestowed on us a great, grave world responsibility. We shall be a mighty force at the peace table. Men everywhere will look to us to give them a good peace. We dare not fail. To us men look for a genuine peace, and we must leave no stone unturned to give it to them when victory comes to our arms.

There is so much involved in the war into which we have been thrust and in which we are necessarily engaged that it cannot be believed that the end is even now near at hand. This is a total war. It not only encompasses substantially the whole world but it has its relationship to the freedom and peace of the world now and for generations to come. There are two determinations, one pitted against the other. On the one hand the determination is that one country shall be free and the rest of the world slave. The other determination is that all men shall be free—free as embodied in the statement of the "four freedoms," and all men free to live.

We believe that we shall succeed and not only in victory to our arms, but that we shall succeed in helping the world to a lasting peace, where human rights are regarded, the dignity of man realized, and the moral law upheld; and where it shall be established that "righteousness exalteth a nation" and that "sin is a reproach to any people."

Now we are engaged in a great struggle to overcome the evil forces of the world, who regard neither God nor man. These we must indeed overcome. Therefore it shall be our duty to see that justice and truth prevail in the affairs of men and nations, at least, to con-

tribute our full share toward that realization.

I am going home. I believe it is well that we, the Members of the Congress, do go home and mingle with our people, hearing them and asking them to hear us. But I would warn that the wisdom of our going depends on what we expect to say. Shall we forget that our country is imperiled and talk politics or gloat in complaints about what everybody but us does? Or shall we spend our time in urging or, at the least, contributing to sentiments of strife and division among our folks? Or will we counsel toleration and advise a direct appeal for correction of what we deem errors rather than indulge in idle recriminations and glory in producing resentments?

I do not want to hear much about politics when I go home. I want to hear about a country united in a common cause. I do not want to hear much from candidates for office for reasons of their personal preferment. I want to hear men talk about what they are willing to do for their country.

I want to have opportunity for our reasoning together, in soberness and not bitterness, in unity and not strife, on the subject of our common good and the earliest conclusion of this war possible with complete and lasting victory and peace. I want us to be, in truth and not pretense only, Americans first.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman think that the high principles which he has just enunciated are the very essence of good politics?

Mr. FOLGER. Yes; if you do not mix it with common partisanship.

INVESTIGATION OF CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF HIGHWAYS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 243), authorizing a study and investigation of the construction and maintenance of highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the Government exercises jurisdiction, which was referred to the House Calendar and order to be printed.

Resolved, That the Committee on Roads, as a whole or by subcommittees, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the construction and maintenance of highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the Government or any agency thereof exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof, and practices incidental thereto, whether private or governmental, which affect or may affect the use, construction, and maintenance of such highways, roads, streets, and bridges.

The committee shall report from time to time to the House the results of its investigations and studies, and in its reports the committee may recommend such legislation as may be deemed pertinent.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the

United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpoena or otherwise, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman. Oaths or affirmations may be administered by the chairman or any member of the committee designated by him.

TAX PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH GOVERNMENT ACQUISITION OF LANDS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 281) authorizing a study and investigation of tax problems connected with acquisition of land, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Public Lands, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, or subcommittees, is authorized and directed to make a study of the problems in connection with the public lands of the United States; including, but not limited to, (1) an investigation of the tax problems connected with the acquisition of such lands and burden upon local units by reason of use of large tracts of public lands for public use, the effect upon grazing areas and other incidental problems; (2) the study of a homestead program; and (3) a study of the use of such program to assist in the rehabilitation of men discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, by subpoena or otherwise, to take such testimony, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE PETROLEUM SITUATION AS IT AFFECTS THE ARMY, THE NAVY, AND CIVILIANS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, a subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee, has for the last few

months been engaged in an extensive investigation of the petroleum situation affecting the Army, Navy and civilian program.

This subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, recently returned to Washington after visiting several of the oil-producing centers in the country. At each of these places—Decatur, Ill.; Eldorado, Ark.; Jackson, Miss.; Dallas, Tex., and New Orleans, La.—we conducted comprehensive hearings on every phase of the oil industry. Prior to this tour, our subcommittee worked for several months in Washington. Of necessity most of the hearings here were held in executive session at the request of the Army, Navy and the Petroleum Administrator for War. We have given no publicity to any of our activities to this date. Our group was and is interested in results and not in publicity. The report of our findings is now being drafted. I felt, however, that since this report will not be ready for some time, there are some important phases of the petroleum problem which the Members of the House should carry home with them for consideration during the coming recess.

Your constituents, particularly those who reside along the eastern seaboard, and especially in New England, are going to want to know what, if anything, is being done to prevent a recurrence of the tragic conditions which prevailed last winter.

You Members from the Midwest, and the Farm Belt particularly, are going to be asked to explain where the petroleum is coming from to gather the harvest with which to feed our own people and also meet the obligations this country has made to our gallant allies. We are all going to be asked, even you who represent oil-producing areas, just what is planned to be done with respect to future rationing of petroleum—I regret to advise you that I cannot hazard a guess on the mental machinations of Mr. Ickes or the O. P. A.—I can only tell you that our findings indicate that the petroleum problem forecasts an impending crisis unless we take action to encourage more exploration, more production and the finding of additional oil reserves not only for victory in the great war we are now fighting, but also for adequate oil to supply generations yet unborn.

And right at this point may I say that if everybody in the United States knew that we are using about twice the amount of gasoline, twice the amount of petroleum that we are finding, the people of this Nation would wake up and demand that additional safeguards be provided to see that we produce what is necessary for our armed forces and to meet our needs.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wonder if the gentleman can advise us whether his committee inquired to what extent the oil fields of the eastern Mediterranean area, that is, Iran and Iraq, are furnishing oil; whether those fields are contributing to the war effort.

Mr. RIVERS. The resolution creating the committee, with which the gentleman is familiar, primarily directed the committee to investigate the petroleum situation as it affected the eastern seaboard, and furnishing petroleum to the Army, the Navy, and the civilian needs.

We went into that question a little, but we did not get a great deal of information on it.

Now, let me make it plain that the committee has worked with the prime thought in view that we must first provide adequate petroleum supplies for our armed forces. For them there can be no rationing. Our ships must be kept in action, our planes must be kept in the air, and our land forces must aggressively move forward.

I want to express for myself and my committee our deep appreciation of the fine cooperation extended to us by the producing branch of the oil industry during our recent tour. These men, imbued with the spirit of the American pioneer, convinced us of their earnest desire to find new reserves and produce more oil. They brought to us their problems. We advised them that we would present these problems to the Congress of the United States and attempt to bring about, as far as possible, an alleviation that will enable them to continue, hampered only by those impediments which we all must face because of the exigencies of war. In all great oil-producing States which we visited we found identical problems. I briefly summarize them, as follows:

First. Subparity prices for crude oil.

Second. Governmental red tape.

Third. Failure of the manpower authority to accord to the industry proper recognition with respect to importance of personnel, long classified as essential to the industry.

Fourth. Denial by the W. P. B. of priorities for adequate materials with which to drill new wells and find new reserves.

We were advised by qualified witnesses, representing both the major and independent interests, that increases in the price ceilings on crude oil are essential to the stimulation of additional exploration and production. Operators of so-called stripper wells testified that the increased overhead for pumping is causing abandonment of many of these wells which could produce oil for many years to come. A stripper well, in the language of the oil man, is a well which has lost its natural pressure and must be pumped.

The subject of governmental red tape was one upon which almost all our witnesses dwelt at considerable length—delay by the Petroleum Administrator's office in even considering applications for drilling permits; centralized control of the industry in Washington, with State regulatory bodies completely ignored and rendered impotent; adoption of nearly impractical and almost inflexible regulations not capable of being applied to all oil-producing areas, and lack of a clear understanding by P. A. W. personnel of the problems of each of the respective oil regions of the country.

An oil producer, with holdings in Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi,

and other States, came to me in Dallas to complain privately concerning the delay of the P. A. W. in considering his application for drilling permits. He told me of an instance in which he had been assured of a drilling permit, had set up his rig on location, and then had to wait 10 days, at a loss to him of \$500 per day, until the arrival from Washington of his drilling permit. He was asked to take the witness stand and testify for the record. His answer was that he was afraid to do it—because of possible reprisals and delays on future applications. I, therefore, would not insist that he take the witness stand to testify on this matter.

The chief complaint of the officials of State regulatory bodies is that their advice is being completely ignored in the administering of the wartime petroleum program. These agencies, all of them with a background of years of successful practical experience and localized knowledge of petroleum problems, should be given a voice in the solution of these problems in their respective States. The Honorable Beauford H. Jeter, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, testified that his commission had advocated to P. A. W. a gradual increase in Texas production, to build up a petroleum stock pile for the increasing war need. His advice was ignored and the stock pile was not built up. It may now be noted that within the last 2 weeks, Texas was ordered by P. A. W. to produce more oil for immediate use.

It has been the policy of the P. A. W. to issue over-all regulations concerning the spacing of wells. Such regulations have generally specified that only one well be drilled to each 40 acres of land surface. Dr. J. Huner, Jr., Louisiana State geologist, testified that these regulations could not be made to apply alike to the entire Nation. It was pointed out that in some strata, one well may be adequate for 5 acres, while in others, a larger producing well might pull from more than 40 acres. You can readily see, then, why these State advisers would like to have a word in the production of petroleum for our wartime needs. On the same point, Dr. H. M. Morse, Mississippi State oil and gas supervisor, testified that the 40-acre spacing rule would never permit efficient withdrawal of the oil from the sands of his State, which, in places, are 100 feet thick and in other places dwindle down to a thickness of 8 feet. The thicker sands will accommodate one well to every 5 to 10 acres without any waste whatever.

It was not until recently that the local selective service boards were directed by national headquarters at Washington to consider men engaged in production of petroleum supplies as essential to the war effort and eligible for deferment. The men of draft age working on development and production crews have been trained over a period of years and are irreplaceable. The armed forces do not have billets for men of this type of scientific training. I am glad to know that the War Manpower Commission has at last recognized that the work of these men is essential to the war effort.

This is a mechanized war, and oil is the foundation upon which we will eventually ride into Berlin and Tokyo.

The question of materials for drilling concerns the independent more than the major. The large oil companies maintain stock piles of equipment. They also have offices in Washington, where representatives are in daily contact with the Federal agencies. But the independent is the man who discovers the oil. The records show that the independent "wildcatter" has brought in approximately 75 percent of the new fields found during the last 5 years. Before that he brought in almost all our new fields. He is the one who needs and should have relief. Responsibility for delay in expediting priorities for these independent "wildcatters" rests upon the shoulders of Mr. Harold Ickes and his associates in the P. A. W. The W. P. B. set up the regulations for the granting of priorities to the oil industry, but the administration of this program and the issuing of priority orders was accorded to the P. A. W. These orders, generally speaking, stymied the efforts of the independent producer. I believe that it is possible to work out a system of expediting such orders whereby the pioneering spirit of the "wildcatter" in the oil business may be encouraged. To force him to wait and delay his activities pending consideration by the P. A. W. of each individual application will prove disastrous to the war effort.

Now, you all know about the subsidy which was necessary in order to make it possible for the railroads to bring this petroleum to a famished and freezing East. Under this program, brought about by a submarine menace and the requisitioning of ocean tankers to the military service, it has been necessary that the railroads bear the brunt of the transportation of oil to the Atlantic Coastal States.

The cost of rail transportation is, of course, much higher than the cost by ocean movement or by pipe line. The taxpayers of the Nation are paying the difference in a subsidy amounting to approximately \$1 per barrel. The railroads are moving about 900,000 barrels of oil daily to the eastern seaboard. This means that approximately \$900,000 per day is being taken from the pockets of the taxpayers to pay these transportation costs. A small portion of this is absorbed by increased prices on petroleum products. But most of it is paid by the Defense Supplies Corporation. This amounts in round figures to over a third of a billion dollars a year at the present rate—enough to build three pipe lines from Texas to New York.

Of course, when the pipe lines now under construction have been completed, this cost will be reduced. We have been presented evidence to show that pipeline transportation is cheaper than movement by ocean tanker, even in peacetime. So the answer to this situation is, in my opinion, pipe lines, pipe lines, and more pipe lines.

Now, in answer to the question which naturally arises in your respective minds, where shall these lines originate? First, I will start with the State of Texas. The chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission stated to my committee in no uncertain terms that, if allowed economically to produce under a plan submitted

to the P. A. W. by his commission, his State could contribute in excess of 300,000 barrels a day to the war effort without injury to the fields or waste in producing. This same condition prevails in Illinois, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi.

While we are on the subject of Mississippi, I would like to call to your attention that the Congress of the United States, about a year ago, authorized a pipe line to be constructed from Mississippi to the east coast. To this date, the Petroleum Administrator, through one Mr. Ralph K. Davies, the Deputy Administrator, has refused to permit its construction, merely because he alleges that the reserves in Mississippi do not warrant such construction.

This is an astounding position for Mr. Davies to take. His company, the Standard Oil Co. of California, has leased in excess of 133,000 acres of prospective oil lands in 12 counties in the same Mississippi which he claims will be dry in a very short period of time. What do you think his company is going to do with this land—grow corn and cotton? Testimony from every authority in the State of Mississippi and numerous producers there indicates that an estimate of the reserves in the Tinsley field alone are in excess of 250,000,000 barrels. You boys from the oil-producing States, can you envision any territory producing over 55,000,000 barrels during the last 2 years without a pipe line? Today that is the story of Mississippi.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Why does not the gentleman suggest that a committee be created to work out this problem while the House is in recess; to make a study of the problem and have some recommendation to make to the Congress when it reconvenes? The situation is critical; is it not?

Mr. RIVERS. The situation is so critical, as I stated, that if the people knew to what extent we are using petroleum they would insist that something be done about it.

Mr. FISH. Why is it not the duty of Congress to act, to create a committee to make a recommendation, rather than just talk about it?

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentleman's committee will give us the resolution we will be glad to do so.

Mr. FISH. What I would like to see is action and not just discussion.

Mr. RIVERS. If the subcommittee from the Naval Affairs Committee is given the opportunity it will have a recommendation which I think will be pleasing to the entire Congress.

Mr. FISH. I feel that Congress should stop passing the buck, stop talking so much, because I think it has a duty to perform.

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentleman will read our report, he will not feel we are passing the buck.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. I believe the subcommittee of which the gentleman is chairman has full authority to proceed during recess and I hope they will do so.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman may be sure that I have not laid down on the job since I have been on the committee, and I think the members of my committee feel about the same way.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes in order that I may yield to these gentlemen who wish to ask me questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the gentleman from South Carolina that there are several other special orders still pending.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, could not the gentleman make that request and take his time after the other special orders are disposed of?

Mr. RIVERS. This is a very vital question in which many Members are interested.

Mr. FISH. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman not so much that it should be talked about but that we should get action. I do not, however, think that those Members who have other special orders should have to wait. I will have to ask for the regular order.

Mr. RIVERS. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further. I want to say to the Members, and I want you to listen closely, in answer to the question that naturally arises in your minds: What are we going to do about it? First of all, we have got to formulate regulations and we have got to find ways of getting oil to the rest of the country, to increase production, to stimulate interest, and to find a way of bringing oil from the producing areas to the consuming areas. More pipe lines have got to be built. No oil field in the world was ever developed until it had a pipe line.

Let me tell you the story of Mississippi. About a year ago the Congress authorized a pipe line to be built from Mississippi to the east coast, but the Petroleum Administration said there was not any oil in Mississippi. My group went down into Mississippi and held hearings and got the record of applications of those who had filed for leases over the State. We found that the Ralph K. Davies organization, the Standard Oil Co. of California—the organization of the man who had signed the letter saying there was not any oil in Mississippi—had already filed on 130,000 acres of leases for the purpose of drilling for oil. I do not think the Standard Oil Co. of California plants cotton, I do not think it plants corn. The same man who said there was no oil in Mississippi got 130,000 acres of leases, enough to supply half a dozen pipe lines.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, was that producing land?

Mr. RIVERS. It is right near some producing land.

Mr. ROLPH. But it is not producing land?

Mr. RIVERS. No; it is not producing land yet.

In conclusion let me give you my personal opinion: If the oil-producing areas of the United States were not hamstrung by governmental regulations, discouraged and demoralized by Federal indecision and centralization, were given adequate pipe-line transportation, were given materials and equipment with which to find and produce oil, were emancipated from bureaucratic bondage, we would not be faced today with the paradox of a petroleum famine in the land of plenty.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for me to submit a unanimous-consent request? I withdraw my request for the regular order and should like to ask that the gentleman be given the right to proceed for additional time.

Mr. RIVERS. I appreciate the gentleman's charity, but I am finished.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, that since his visit to Illinois I have received several very fine letters on the part of petroleum producers expressing their appreciation of the opportunity of coming before his committee and complimenting him and the other members for the manner in which they carried on their investigation. I know they appreciate it, and I am sure they all realize that the gentleman is making a contribution to the solution of this important problem, and I trust he will continue his efforts along that line.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman. Let me say to the gentleman that his effort in getting witnesses for us was very helpful.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

FORREST W. DICKEY

Mr. McGEHEE filed a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 235) for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey for printing under the rule.

FLORENCE B. HUTCHINSON

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson for printing under the rule.

GUARDIAN OF LEONARD L. GAY

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay for printing under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include an excerpt from a book entitled "Men in Motion," by Henry J. Taylor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD, and to include an article from Nation's Business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a statement of Jesse Jones of the R. F. C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a very serious situation that has arisen in the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board. We have permitted a situation to develop which presents possibly the greatest threat to our freedom for which we are fighting this war that has yet confronted us.

We are in this war to preserve our freedom and, insofar as possible, to extend that freedom to the other peoples of the world. We can never extend it to others if we lose it ourselves.

There can be no real threat to our freedom, no matter how much we may have to be regimented for the purpose of more effectively carrying on this terrible war, so long as we have reasonable and adequate freedom of the spoken and written word.

If the people are given all the facts and permitted to hear and read all of the divergent opinions by the experts and nonexperts, there is little danger that they will arrive at anything but the right conclusions. Let the people know the facts, have access to all sides of public questions, and the people as a whole will screen out the false and will form their conclusions and base their actions upon the truth.

The most powerful weapon in the preservation of freedom is an informed public opinion. No amount of propaganda, foreign or domestic, will fool the American people if they retain a free press to give them all the facts.

Of course, in time of war, censorship is necessary to deny to the enemy information which would be of value to them in their operations against us. No one can legitimately object to a properly administered censorship. Recognizing that necessity, the Congress authorized the establishment of an Office of Censorship.

There is a shortage of many critical materials in this country and not enough of many items for unlimited civilian use and full prosecution of the war. So, an office was created to balance the military needs and the civilian requirements. In other words, to allocate production of materials that were insufficient for all demands. This office is now known as the War Production Board.

It certainly was never intended that the control of production should be used

also as an agency for censorship and above and beyond and outside the authority granted to the Office of Censorship. And yet, that is exactly the situation with which we find ourselves confronted. The real threat to the freedom of the press is not from the Office of Censorship but from the War Production Board.

A shortage of newsprint having become apparent, the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board issued two directives on December 31, 1942. They are orders L-240 and L-244.

L-240 limited the use of print paper for newspapers in any current quarter to the amount used in the corresponding quarter of 1941. Order L-244 limited the use of print paper for magazines in any current quarter to 22½ percent of the total amount used in the year 1942.

In each instance, the purpose was to effect a substantial curtailment of paper consumption. In the case of newspapers, by restriction to the 1941 use; in the case of magazines, by limitation to 90 percent of the 1942 use.

Each order gave the party who would otherwise be bound by the original order the right to appeal from its provision. By a separate W. P. B. order—Administrative Order No. 13—effective January 18, 1943, it was provided that appeal should be granted only when it was a hardship or an injustice in particular cases.

However, both the Printing and Publishing Division and the Appeals Board have refused to define "hardship" and have refused to make known their standard or formula for determining the basis of exceptions, if they have any such standard or formula.

No one in authority in the War Production Board will state whether hardship is to be judged in the light of financial loss, or curtailment of circulation, or loss of prestige, or limitation on expansion or any other test by which the publisher might present his appeal based on hardship.

It is difficult to press an appeal when none of the rules governing the appeal is known, and very difficult to conduct the appeal when the Board refuses to set forth the rules, even during the hearing of an appeal.

The officials in the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board refuse to state the basis upon which appeals for exceptions to the limitation orders are granted and denied. They refuse to explain or give any reason whatever to an appellant as to the treatment of his competitors.

Mr. GALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GALE. In the gentleman's opinion, is this action on the part of the W. P. B. an isolated arbitrary case, or is it a part of a general policy existing all through the administration?

Mr. MAAS. I am very much afraid what I am going to state as typical in the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board is rather typical throughout the whole Government, par-

ticularly in the so-called war agencies that have been newly created.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I may say to the gentleman that I have some figures here with reference to the amounts that have been allowed in these hardship cases, and I would be glad to give the gentleman these figures if he does not have them here.

Mr. MAAS. I shall be very glad to obtain those figures. How long will it take to read them?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. One minute.

Mr. MAAS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I have a letter here under date of June 29 from H. M. Bitner, Director of the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board, with reference to the very thing of which the gentleman speaks. He talks about procedure in general when these hardship cases are brought before the Board and makes this further comment:

A total of 124,241 tons of additional paper have been granted to 501 newspapers to date. Six newspapers received 41 percent of this amount. The largest allowance, 17,525 tons, was made to a newspaper which commenced publication in December 1941, and therefore had no practicable base period usage under the order. Its appeal, therefore, was for the establishment of a quota not for the right to use paper in addition to its quota.

The second and third largest grants, aggregating 21,598 tons, were in a city where one of the largest newspapers went out of business in the latter part of 1941. Its circulation and advertising were taken over by a competing newspaper and the paper quota which it would have used was likewise divided among the other publishers in the field. In addition, there was a large population increase in that city.

Eleven thousand eight hundred and ninety-four tons were granted to three newspapers in a city which has had probably the largest influx of population (approximately 370,000 in the last 10 years).

That gives an idea of the very thing that the gentleman points out as to the broad and extensive scope of these powers which this division is exercising.

Mr. MAAS. I am glad to have that because I can get no information at all as to what they base their standards on for allowing exceptions to the order.

The process of setting appeals for a hearing and decisions are arbitrary and very frequently involve long and unexplained delays.

A publisher, because of the secret proceedings and the secret results, cannot learn if competitors have been granted exceptions and if they do learn from outside sources that a competitor has been granted exception, they are curiously refused any information as to the basis for granting the exception.

The result is that it is impossible to prepare an intelligent appeal on the basis of hardship because no rules are laid down, hearings are secret and confidential, results are not announced, and the whole proceeding is so mysterious that it creates suspicion and chaos in the industry.

There can be no justification for such secret proceedings, certainly not on the basis that it would disclose military information which would aid our enemies. Nor do W. P. B. officials even allege such a motive for maintaining secrecy. Their excuse that they must protect competitors from business secrets is just as ridiculous as to intimate that the facts would be of aid to Hirohito or Hitler.

A. B. C.—Audit Bureau of Circulations—has possession of and regularly publishes circulation figures, newsstand sales, and so forth, of all reputable publications so that excuse is a crude subterfuge. Certainly there would be far less damage to business by publishing these figures than the mysterious secret action of the division which operates with unknown rules and makes decisions that are based on arbitrary actions.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that when newspapers and the newspaper industry are at the mercy of the whims of some individual in a bureau rather than being regulated by published law and rules, there is a tendency for the contents of those newspapers to conform with what the bureaus want said?

Mr. MAAS. Certainly. Censorship by controlling the paper for printing the written word is potentially one of the most dangerous practices ever permitted in this country. The control of paper is being handled by secret proceedings based upon orders that have never been reviewed by Congress—the only law-making authority of the Government.

The officials who wield this tremendous power to issue orders that have the effect of law are not elected by the people, and they and their action are not subjected to scrutiny by anybody that is elected by the people as they are not subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The greatest safeguard of the people's freedom from the arbitrary decisions of officials who are delegated great discretionary powers is full publicity of the proceedings conducted by such officials and full publication of the results of their actions and decisions.

Such full publicity is the only sure safeguard against ultimate dictatorial abuse. Control of the daily press, magazines, and book publishing is far too dangerous a thing to repose in the hands of officials without adequate checks. The way to prevent abuses of this great power is to have public reports on decisions affecting the allocation of paper with a statement for the reasons for such decisions.

A book that is objectionable to the administration in power may be choked off; and may, in fact, be suppressed after the first edition by denial of paper for further editions, if additional paper is required for its publication. Under similar circumstances a new book may be stopped from being published at all. At the same time a book favoring the administration may be fostered by virtually unlimited grants of paper. It is

hardly necessary for me to point out here how potent a medium for influencing public opinion books are.

I wish to cite a concrete case. A former officer who served in the south Pacific, who is now a Member of Congress, was urged to write a book, particularly about the situation in the Pacific. Several publishers sought a book from him. He finally signed a contract with a publisher. Much of the work on the book had been done. It was to have been published within the month. The publisher in making his application for allotment of paper was asked to submit his schedule of prospective books, their titles, and their authors. This was done. When paper was requested for this Congressman's proposed book, an official of the War Production Board advised the publisher that he could have no paper for any such purpose.

Whether the book would have made any valuable contribution to the general subject or not is beside the point. The officials of the W. P. B. did not see the manuscript, did not request to see it.

It is apparent that these bureaucrats are seeking to dominate what is published by controlling the allotment of white paper.

Magazines play a great part in the life of the average American. The control of magazines by the War Production Board has become arbitrary if not capricious.

One example of the potential abuse in the control of magazines is evident in the W. P. B. allowing new publications to start up in 1943 and at the same time reducing the amount of paper available to a long-established magazine in the same field.

This can become a vicious device to put out of business a magazine whose policies displease the administration and on the other hand to create and subsidize a new competitor who will play ball with the bureaucrats in the administration.

An example of this type of abuse lies in the case of A, an aviation publication of long standing, a leader in its field. They requested additional paper to get out a special edition for one of the branches of the Army.

The additional paper was necessary to carry matter that was requested by this branch of the Army, and most of the articles which were of a technical or informative nature were to be written by Army officers. This magazine circulates widely to the personnel of the Army and Navy, as well as to the industry and general public, and is frequently used as a textbook by the military as well as industry.

Granting the additional paper required would have been an actual economy of paper as well as money as it would have saved the Army from directly publishing the same material at Government expense and with far greater waste in paper. The high officers in this branch of the Army urgently requested the W. P. B. to grant the application of the publisher for this paper.

These urgent requests were put in writing; were supplemented by appeals

on the telephone. The request for additional paper was denied.

Publisher B started a new magazine in the same field late in 1942. Apparently intending to have a vigorous policy this magazine contracted with a foreign war correspondent who had been in the South Pacific for an article on conditions in that area.

The article was critical of the lack of unity of command and failure to have adequate air support. The publisher apparently was delighted. Part of the article in the next issue was already set up and about to come off the press when the publisher was advised that the article was looked upon with great disfavor and that "pressure from above" would undoubtedly result in W. P. B.'s denying them sufficient paper to continue if the issue appeared on the stands with this article.

The publisher who would be put out of existence by being limited to 90 percent of the amount of paper he had in 1942 yielded and at considerable expense tore the article out of the edition, substituted an innocuous article, and brought the magazine to the newsstands in a form entirely favorable to the W. P. B. officials.

Publisher B thereafter was allowed a usage in his paper for the base year of 1942 of 12 times the average monthly usage during the short period of existence, less a minor adjustment for excessively heavier paper.

There is evidence of a definite hostility on the part of the War Production Board Printing and Publishing Division, as well as other divisions of that organization, toward the military services. Much, if not most, of the paper being used by Government agencies is in propaganda. If the Government would restrict itself to the amount of paper actually necessary to run the Government and win the war, there would be no paper shortage in this country.

As further indications of the danger of permitting bureaucrats to have unlimited and arbitrary views without any kind of check is the manner in which hearings on appeals from the paper limitation order are conducted. In at least one hearing, responsible W. P. B. officials misrepresented and even lied about the facts.

Favoritism had been definitely demonstrated in numerous cases. War Production Board Printing and Publishing Division has on numerous occasions disregarded urgent appeals by other Government agencies, such as the United States Army, Department of Agriculture, Nelson Rockefeller committee, for grants of paper to publications that were co-operating with these agencies and performing an essential service for them.

The attitude of W. P. B. officials in these cases has shown a spirit of the bureaucrats' thirst for power and the arbitrary attitude that is inconsistent with democracy even during a war.

Frequently, the purpose for which the additional paper is requested in the interest of the war effort is defeated indirectly by insufferable delays and the refusal to give the basis or any reason for such actions.

They have been also very inconsistent in their policy. For instance, they denied the request of a private publisher for paper to get out a Victory garden handbook, which book was urgently supported and the request for the paper made to the War Production Board by the Department of Agriculture.

In this case, the War Production Board gave a reason. They said it was because the Government was going to publish a free book on that subject and therefore they would not allow paper for unnecessary duplication to compete with a Government publication. On the other hand, War Production Board officials refused the request of the Army for additional paper for a magazine to publish technical articles desired by the Army and again they gave the reason. They said that would compete with professional writers who might want to write on those same subjects sometime in the nebulous future.

I do not suggest that the press and book and magazine publishers be exempt from rationing if rationing be needed but I do suggest that such rationing be by law and not by bureaucratic whimsy, prejudice, and favoritism.

A new and foreign principle of law is creeping into our jurisprudence. Officials who were never elected nor passed upon by representatives of the people are delegated the power to issue orders that have the effect of law and that carry economic and even criminal penalties.

They operate with no rules, no standards, and in star-chamber proceedings issue secret orders from which, in effect, there is no appeal. Such orders, proceedings, and decisions are not subject to a check or even a review by the Congress.

There is something very sinister in this situation since no one seems to be able to fix responsibility nor to learn the identity of officials who really determine the policy and make the decisions. In the case of the Printing and Publishing Division, most of the key or front officials have changed. Most of them have resigned but the mysterious secret policy continues unaffected. What is back of all of this? Who is back of all of it? Tampering with the freedom of the press is a dangerous thing. Control of the press which would mean violation of the freedom of the press would be the prelude to the loss of all our freedoms. In the case of paper, the announced objective of paper limitation orders 240 and 244 was to reduce the paper consumption by at least 10 percent. Actually so far it appears not to have been reduced by much more than 1 percent; and in May 1943, it was reported to be actually 2.4 percent more than in May 1942. What has really happened is that the amount of paper consumed is virtually no less than it was before but a considerable shift in its use has been brought about.

The use of paper by those not favorable to nor favored by the self-perpetuating, politically minded bureaucrats has been reduced, and paper has been increased to those who for personal reasons or through fear have surrendered their independence to the bureaucrats. The method of gaining control is apparent. It is the old method of divide and

destroy. The weaker branch of publishing—magazines and books—are being attacked first. Some 400 requests for additional paper for newspapers have been granted. The "bite" has been put on magazines and books. When they are brought under sufficient control to eliminate them as a threat to the complete control of publishing, the newspapers will then feel the heavy hand of bureaucracy.

The base period for magazines is 1942 and the base period for newspapers is 1941. This is an arbitrary rule and can and may be changed at will. For instance, the change for the base period of magazines to 1939 instead of 1942, as at present, would wipe out most, if not all, of the magazines that are not 100 percent subservient to these bureaucrats. The same thing could and might happen to newspapers. Exceptions can always be granted, and, therefore, those who are willing to play ball with the administration or who are forced to capitulate to it may be allowed to continue and even to expand. Whenever extra paper is allowed to one publisher, it has to be taken away from another. Certainly, up to the present time, the trend has clearly indicated that increased paper is not being allowed to those who oppose the administration and who do not stand in favor with the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board. I do not charge that this method of dealing with control of paper was designed for ulterior and sinister purposes, but I do charge that a perfect system has been evolved which is capable of abuses and that these abuses are almost inevitable in time.

We are getting altogether too much government by personalities and not by law as was intended by the framers of our Constitution. The opportunity for discrimination, favoritism, and retaliation by entrenched bureaucrats is altogether too apparent. The temptation to wield such powers in such manner seems irresistible. This thing has been creeping upon us so insidiously that we have hardly realized what has taken place. Sound, substantial, patriotic, fundamental Americans start out to administer these bureaus, are often forced out quietly and seldom with public notice. They are usually replaced by men without experience in their field but with preconceived social-reform programs. We are placing in their hands the chance and the opportunity to inflict their social schemes upon us without congressional authority, without even the benefit of debate and public examination. The freedom of the press is so sacred to Americans and so essential to the preservation of our liberties that I suggest that special treatment be given to this subject.

White paper for the purpose of distributing the written word is not a commodity like tin and rubber and cannot be dealt with in the same manner. I urge that the War Production Board be required to announce its standards for granting or denying appeals, that it be required to define hardships and then to publish its rules and its proceedings or at least to make them available for public examination, and that they report to

the Congress all appeals for exceptions from the limitation order and all decisions made thereunder, with explanations in each case. This procedure will assure to the people of the United States that under the guise of rationing a lessened supply of paper will not be abused now nor in the future nor used to subversively gain control of the press of this country. With a free press we will always be a free people.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], who is now upon the floor, permit me to say that never from the Well of this House has anything been said by me against any man or any group of men because of color, race, or creed. The gentleman complained somewhat bitterly, as he has before, because, he says, the racial issue has been raised here. I know of no one who has spoken more frequently or at greater length referring to racial questions in which people of his race are interested than has the gentleman from New York. In saying that, no criticism is made. Merely a fact is stated.

The gentleman complained, too, because the House had created so many special committees and he complained of the work of those committees in some instances. Then he complained because the committees had not taken up other lines of work, and then he complained because another special committee which he desired appointed had not been sanctioned by the House. I ask the gentleman, am I correct in that statement?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not think the gentleman got my point very well at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Maybe not.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman is stretching the thing more than I actually said on the floor here. I simply said that there were a number of committees created which were good, and some of them we could have done without. That is all I said about that. I did not make any accusation against the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no, I understand; the complaint was about the action of the House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I did not make any accusation against anybody.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman then complained about the way in which the German and the Japanese prisoners were used in this country. None of us want to coddle those prisoners, but I think most of us realize that for every German or Japanese we have here there are 10 or perhaps a hundred Americans, civilians, or prisoners of war, men who fought in the war, in the hands of our enemies,

and that if we start holding down our prisoners, refusing them proper food, denying them decent treatment, the natural result will be that our people in these other lands in the hands of our enemies will suffer more severely. All should follow, in a liberal manner, the rules of the Geneva Convention. None should forget that we are human beings.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; not now. I cannot. My thought is this: The thing for us to do with all of our prisoners is to treat them according to the regulations of war, or a little better, in the hope that our enemies, having our people in their hands, will some time learn that that is the proper way, the only way for civilized people to treat prisoners of war. If we want to punish anyone, we will do it after the war is over when we have those who are guilty of mistreatment of our men in our hands, where we can inflict punishment upon them and where under no circumstances will the result of any severity which we might impose on their nationals be imposed upon our men and women over there.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Do you think there will be any punishment of those fellows after the war?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what I think. I think those who violate the rules of war should be punished, but what I think or what you think or what anyone else thinks about that is all beside the point. It is the present situation that I am trying to discuss.

Now, with reference to this question of adjournment, and the things that are still before us for solution: I have noticed in the papers in the last few days where Mr. Fly of the Federal Communications Commission accused the military and naval authorities of following a course which, broadly speaking, gives aid and comfort to the enemy. That is about the substance of it. That is an unfounded and unjust charge. The charge itself makes our men in service wonder if all is well on the home front. Then we have Mr. WALLACE accusing Mr. Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Secretary of Commerce, of following a course of action which hinders our ultimate success. Then again, in almost the next breath, we have Mr. Jones making a like charge against Vice President WALLACE. Then we have each of them saying that the other's charge is without foundation, as a matter of fact. What material for the enemies' propaganda machine. They do not use that brief and ugly word, but that is the meaning of it. We should insist that the truth be known. If either is guilty of one-half the charges made he should be fired or impeached. If neither is guilty there should be retraction and full explanation of any and all false statements. Is there any reason why Mr. Fly should be permitted to get away with his charge that the Army and the Navy are interfering with the war effort? Down here in the District not so long ago, some thirty-odd citizens were

indicted for sedition because it was said the things that they wrote or circulated interfered with the morale of our men. Could anything do more to discourage our men who are abroad than these contradictory statements on the part of these high ranking officials?

Then, again, we have Mr. Petrillo, the gentleman who says that no music shall be made a matter of record. We perhaps can get easily along without songs and jazz here at home, but is there any reason why our boys, who are across, should be denied listening to some of the old hymns and some of the old tunes and some of the old songs? Is there? Who is this man? Where does he come from and where does he get his authority, I ask you, that he should say that here in America there should be no more freedom of recording? No more records which in the frozen north or in the South Seas should be played to cheer our men who are so far from home.

On July 27, 1942, a bill was introduced by me which would make it an offense to interfere with the production, reproduction, transmission, and dissemination of any music through the air. Why should we not stay here and act on legislation of that kind? It would not take more than a day. We all know it should be done.

Do you know how the boys across look at it? Briefly, let me give you a part of this letter. This is from a boy from my district who is now across. He writes:

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I am beginning to believe that I am indeed fortunate to be located in far-off New Guinea.

There is an optimist for you.

I am beginning to believe that I am indeed very fortunate to be located in far-off New Guinea. Over here we have only the Japs to contend with. They are our enemies, and we intend to drive them into submission.

Only the Japs. And what have we to contend with here? When we hear this letter we who complain of our hardships should hang our heads in shame.

He continues:

I am inclined to believe that this is not the case with the people in the United States. When I hear of pitched battles being fought in the streets of Detroit, one-half million miners striking, and many other acts of the same caliber, I can't help but think perhaps our fighting is being done in vain. If these so-called men are clamoring for action, as I am inclined to believe, I suggest they be given the opportunity to get into some profitable action; that is, induct them into the Army. However, if these men cannot be trusted as civilians, they certainly couldn't be trusted as soldiers.

He does not want any of them as his buddies fighting beside him. He is afraid they might not be there when he needed them.

It is impossible for me to conceive the incentive for these un-American acts, but it does seem as if our Government could do something about it. I have the highest admiration for the men and women of Congress—

I pause for applause, but I do not hear any—

and it is my sincere hope that they will not allow my opinion of them to be altered by allowing the continuation of these riotous

acts. As Representative of my district in Michigan, I trust that you are doing everything possible to improve the situation.

Looking forward to a bigger and better Michigan, I remain,

Faithfully yours,

GARNER A. TOWNE.

There you have it and, of course, there are thousands of boys who think along similar lines, yet here in this administration, in the administration which calls upon Congress—and I join with the gentleman's plea for unity, and charity, and tolerance—yet here this administration which calls for unity—and under these orders thousands of men are making the supreme sacrifice—here the two top managers, the Vice President of the United States, Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, and Mr. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, and Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—here are these two men saying to the other: "You're a liar. What you are doing interferes with the prosecution of the war." And Fly, of the F. C. C., charges the Army and Navy with the same offense. We should stay here until the air is cleared, until we are all back of the servicemen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand there are no other special orders. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. But there are several other special orders.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from a publication called Jewish Comment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEND-LEASE AND THE WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I have been following two agencies rather closely. The appropriations for these two agencies are enormous; their Administrators are popular and have captivated the imagination and deadened the scrutiny that Congress otherwise might be giving to the Government funds they are spending. The Administrators referred to are Admiral Emory S. Land and Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.

Two months ago today I sent a completed questionnaire to E. R. Stettinius, Jr., asking for answers to 68 specific ques-

tions. There is nothing of particular importance about the figure 68. It covered the matter I had under surveillance at that time. I can double my questions today with the inquiries I have made of other departments.

It will be remembered that on May 21 a six-billion-plus bill was before the House for consideration. On that day I raised the issue of Mr. Stettinius' refusal to answer the questions. His excuse was that it would consume valuable manpower that he couldn't afford to give me.

This afternoon I want to discuss a few of those questions in the light of a newspaper article of yesterday released by Mr. Stettinius. The newspaper article says that valuable and strategic materials, necessary to the prosecution of the war, have been released to the Army, Navy, and private industry. Now, I do not claim that my questions, which showed that I had a knowledge of just what was happening in Lend-Lease, caused this improvement in policy, but I just want to let the House, Mr. Stettinius, members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, members of the Appropriations Committee, and the House majority leader to know that my questions were not just an idle attempt to get publicity with reference to this agency. I want the House and the world to know that my inquiries of any agency are to tighten up the war effort and to settle down to the sober business of helping the men at the front to win the war. So, naturally I asked Mr. Stettinius, among my 68 questions, the following questions:

24. The fortunes of war sometimes change the advisability of sending aid to many countries for which you have made commitments for delivery. For instance, Burma, and other countries coming in a general category. How long after these countries were lost temporarily to the Axis have you held the equipment, material, supplies, and services earmarked for them?

25. What was the longest period these were held by the Lend-Lease Administration and not available to the fighting forces, and what is the shortest period?

26. When did you make arrangements to expedite in your administration the availability of materials so earmarked for countries that are fallen, to the Army, Navy, marines, etc., so that lend-lease purchased equipment would be used in the war effort even though originally intended for countries that subsequently fell?

28. Specifically, what has happened to lend-lease material purchased for Burma? How long after the fall of Burma was the reallocation made?

30. Specifically, what has happened to lend-lease material purchased for Holland? How long after the fall of Holland was the reallocation made?

31. Did your Administration attempt to bring this material into the war effort immediately following the change in circumstances from the fall of the respective countries to the Axis, or did the United States Navy?

32. On what date was the redistribution unit, if any, formed within your organization?

33. To what agency or agencies do you transfer this material allocated to fallen countries?

Today I make the further charge that as of the latest date for which I have figures, there were 7,461 carloads of lend-lease freight over 30 days old and that

these cars are unloaded or are on the rails lacking a specific consignee.

I am informed on reliable sources further:

This includes such things as automobiles, trailers, railway equipment, tin plate, iron pipe, heavy chemicals, and wire and wire rope. One of the reasons for the existence of merchandise in this condition is the change in the fortunes of war. To illustrate, the railway equipment was intended for the Burma-Munnar railway, but when the Japs conquered Burma there was little sense in shipping it to pile up on the docks in India if it could be diverted to other uses. Some of this freight has been diverted. Cases can be found where this merchandise has been lying around from 6 to 9 months, but Lend-Lease is aware of the problem and is developing a priority system and a materials redistribution committee to handle the problem. A priority system is necessary to cope with the unpredictable shipping capacity. Table IV shows the total cars on wheels in ports including current shipments and those over 30 days which have not been unloaded.

On June 18 I stated that Congress could not claim that it discharged its obligations by voting "aye" on appropriation bills. It has a further duty to see that the moneys are spent wisely and that we get a penny's worth of warfare for every penny spent. Seven thousand four hundred and sixty-one cars of lend-lease "frustrated freight" without a consignee lying around the country on rails or in warehouses is a considerable loss to the war effort.

I may say that as of the date we had lend-lease before us the majority leader promised me that I would receive the answers to my questions. Almost 2 months have elapsed and not one word from Mr. Stettinius. Apparently he does not dare answer the rest of the questions because they would show up the same kind of situation I have disclosed here in connection with these carloads of "frustrated freight."

I have made the charge before that the Lend-Lease Administration is a civilian set-up that the Army and Navy personnel have both abandoned since Pearl Harbor and if the American people knew all the facts they would want Lend-Lease Administration abandoned.

Lend-lease reports made by Stettinius presume that there is something holy about the term "lend-lease." They have educated the American people through their "halitosis of wordy releases" that the Australians could not use an American ammunition dump unless we had the lend-lease law; that the British could not use an American tank without H. R. 1776. Just as a gentle reminder, let us go back to World War No. 1, and I raise the inquiry, "How could the United States Navy mine the North Sea in 1918 before any New Deal crackpot ever thought up the name 'lend-lease'?"

This is just a sketchy and a very narrow discussion of the Lend-Lease Administration and the things that Congress ought to investigate during this recess but has refused to investigate and will not investigate because of the personal popularity of E. R. Stettinius, Jr.

Now the Maritime Commission has charge of an eleven billion plus appropriation. The personal popularity of Admiral Emory S. Land with the mem-

bership has allowed confusion to exist in the expenditure of funds.

On March 29 I quoted the Black committee report in a statement made on the floor of the House. The Black committee made its report in May of 1935. As a humble citizen in 1935, the Black committee disclosures shocked me, as they did many other citizens throughout the land. That any group of individuals in time of war would rob the Treasury because of the need for ships was just about the lowest performance that the American people had ever contemplated, and they promptly passed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This act provided for the requisition, charter, and insurance of ships in a positive mandate, as follows:

SEC. 902. (a) * * * But in no case shall the value of the property taken or used be deemed enhanced by the causes necessitating the taking or use.

The terms of the statute are positive. The war or imminence of war are the "causes necessitating the taking." One member of the Merchant Marine Committee told Mr. Land that when the 1936 act was passed, unless this provision was put into the law, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 would never have become law. Land did not contradict this observation.

It seems that the public, the ship-owners, and everybody understood it. Now let me show you the chronology of what has happened to the interpretation of the act since then.

On December 19, 1940, Admiral Land had this to say about when section 902 (a) became applicable. He was making a statement before the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations on this date:

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 had a second and coequal purpose, that of providing a merchant marine which will aid in the national defense by serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of national emergency or war. Such an emergency now exists. In the field of maritime activity it was clearly declared by Congress when in July it passed legislation providing for a two-ocean Navy. (P. 440, pt. I Independent Offices Appropriations Hearings, 1942.)

Now there was not any doubt in Admiral Land's mind that an emergency existed, which brought section 902 (a) into operation when he was testifying on December 19, 1940. At a later date, however, Admiral Land seems to have acquired questions in his mind. On November 24, 1942, he wrote the Comptroller General for an opinion as to whether a date would apply and if so, what date would apply for the operation of section 902 (a). On November 28, the Comptroller General sets the date as September 8, 1939, when the act would apply, in his letter to the Maritime Commission, the pertinent portion of which I quote:

The power lawfully to requisition vessels of private owners was, by the express terms of section 902 (a), authorized to be exercised whenever the President shall proclaim that "the security of the national defense makes it advisable or during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President." On September 8, 1939, the President issued the following proclamation:

"Whereas a proclamation issued by me on September 5, 1939, proclaimed the neutrality

of the United States in the war now unhappily existing between certain nations; and

"Whereas this state of war imposes on the United States certain duties with respect to the proper observance, safeguarding, and enforcement of such neutrality, and the strengthening of the national defense within the limits of peacetime authorizations; and

"Whereas measures required at this time all for the exercise of only a limited number of the powers granted in a national emergency: Now therefore,

"I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do proclaim that a national emergency exists, in connection with and to the extent necessary for the proper observance, safeguarding, and enforcing of the neutrality of the United States and the strengthening of our national defense within the limits of peacetime authorizations. Specific directions and authorizations will be given from time to time for carrying out these two purposes."

This proclamation is commonly known and spoken of as the proclamation of a limited national emergency. However, it would seem that, although for some purposes and other connections the emergency might have been a limited one, only, it certainly was such a state as was contemplated by said section 902 (a) with respect to the requisitioning of vessels. (Waterman Steamship Corporation hearings before Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 1942, p. 228.)

On page 27 et seq. of the Waterman Steamship Corporation hearings before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, Hon. FRANCIS CULKIN, of New York, was examining Admiral Land in regard to section 902 (a), as amended by the act of 1939. I quote from the hearings as follows:

MR. CULKIN. Were you in the Commission then?

Admiral LAND. Yes, sir.

MR. CULKIN. You did not raise any constitutional question then?

Admiral LAND. No; I did not raise any constitutional question then, and do not now.

MR. CULKIN. You just raised it.

Admiral LAND. I said there was a controversy. I have nothing to do with the controversy.

MR. CULKIN. That is the provision of law which includes the provision that there shall be no enhancement of value by reason of an emergency?

Admiral LAND. That is true.

MR. CULKIN. That was accepted by your Commission as law, was it not?

Admiral LAND. Yes, sir.

MR. CULKIN. And it was accepted by the operators and those seeking to construct ships?

Admiral LAND. That I do not know; they accepted the law.

MR. CULKIN. You allow your imagination that much play, do you not?

Admiral LAND. Yes.

MR. CULKIN. They knew what was in the law?

Admiral LAND. Yes.

MR. CULKIN. You do not have any illusions about people constructing ships knowing what the law was?

Admiral LAND. None at all.

MR. CULKIN. And they proceeded with this building program which was very highly subsidized?

Admiral LAND. Are you speaking of the case we have in front of us?

MR. CULKIN. I am asking if that is not true.

Admiral LAND. No, sir; Waterman did not.

MR. CULKIN. No; not this case.

Admiral LAND. I asked you; I just want to be clear.

MR. CULKIN. I am talking about the general proposition.

Admiral LAND. You are correct.

Mr. CULKIN. This frontal attack that is being made on this section seems to be in avoidance of what the understanding was between the country and Congress and some of the members of this committee. In other words, aid to construction was presented to the country as being a necessity for national defense, was it not?

Admiral LAND. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. CULKIN. And these ships were to be of value in the event of national emergency without any enhancement of cost, and you read the debates in Congress on that, I assume?

Admiral LAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. CULKIN. Yes. There was no misunderstanding between some of the western groups who were too friendly to subsidize construction and your Commission as to that proposition. In other words, these ships were to be available in the national emergency without enhancement of cost; is that not true?

Admiral LAND. I think so.

Mr. CULKIN. And the country all understood that, including those who were in quasi opposition to the enactment of this law, is that not true?

Admiral LAND. I think so.

Mr. CULKIN. And there is no question about it being the law, now, is there?

Admiral LAND. No, sir; but that does not clear up the question in my mind to the slightest degree about when the law becomes effective. (Waterman Steamship Corporation hearings before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, H. O. R., December 15, 16, 17, 1942, pp. 27 and 28.)

Bear in mind we are talking to an administrator of appropriated funds to the tune of \$11,226,650,000 exclusive of funds allocated to him by other agencies of the Government; a man who has been given an opinion by the Comptroller General, the agent of Congress who should be the final authority on interpretation of the fiscal problems involved in Admiral Land's job. Notwithstanding that fact, Admiral Land, in 1943, at various times has stated that there is a controversy as to when that law is applicable to his requisitioning and chartering of ships.

At page 611 of the war agencies appropriations hearings in the face of positive terms of the statute, in the face of the Comptroller General's letter, and of Congress on January 18, 1943, being questioned by members of the Independent Offices Committee of Appropriations, Admiral Land said:

We have urged using September 1939 as a base. (National war agencies appropriation bill, 1944 hearings, House of Representatives, pt. I, p. 611.)

We are in a controversy with the Comptroller General as to the time requisitioning of vessels was permitted. We felt that the emergency of September 8, 1939, being a limited emergency, did not affect the Maritime Commission in any way; but the unlimited emergency of May 1941 declared by the President did affect the Maritime Commission and brought into operation section 902 (a), which not only requires just compensation, but has the enhancement clause in it. (Independent offices appropriation bill hearings, House of Representatives, 1944, p. 718.)

The above statement was made 25 months after the following statement before the same Subcommittee of Appropriations. On December 19, 1940, Admiral Land said this:

Thus, in the past year, the Maritime Commission's activities have slowly been oriented toward the second of the two goals of the

Merchant Marine Act, until today the Commission is engaged in an extensive national defense program and is exercising its authority over the merchant marine primarily with consideration to national defense. (Independent offices appropriation bill hearings, 1942, p. 440, pt. I.)

And bear in mind in connection with this, he said:

Such an emergency now exists. (Independent offices appropriation bill hearings, 1942, p. 440, pt. I.)

In the independent offices hearings in the spring of this year you will see reported the following colloquy between Mr. DIRKSEN and Admiral Land:

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Commission is going to determine the policy under which this program is going forward, instead of Congress, we had as well know it now.

I want to be clear whether you are going to make this policy, notwithstanding the declared intent of Congress, or whether we are going to make it, and if we are going to make it, we want the Maritime Commission to abide by it.

Admiral LAND. Surely.

Mr. DIRKSEN. * * * I have examined that language (sec. 902) and I find no evidence of the fact that we had embraced in that language a limited emergency. The word "limited" is not carried in the provision of the statute, I think you will agree to that.

Admiral LAND. I agree with that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. * * * There would be a very substantial difference to the taxpayers of the Nation, and there would be a very substantial difference to the Treasury of the United States, I take it, involving the amount of the appropriation and the interpretation of the words "any emergency" whether, under the authority of that act, you could have taken those five ships back from Waterman at a value—that is the statute; it does not say anything about prices; it says, "at a value which shall not be enhanced by any factor or any condition attending emergency."

Mr. DIRKSEN. And for that reason an effort was made to secure an amendment to section 902 at a time when we were in a state of hostilities, and when you, as Chairman of the Maritime Commission, under the act of 1936, as amended by the act of August 1939, were taking existing vessels in the country at prices that should not be enhanced by the emergency.

Admiral LAND. * * * Whether it is right or wrong, we do not know, but we do not feel that section 902 had anything to do with our transaction. If we operated in error, however, we did not know it, and you will not get anything out of me on that. We had to deal with the emergency, and whether it was done rightly or wrongly, that is the way we did it. I offer no excuse whatever for it. We did not do it with any possible idea of defrauding the Government. (Independent offices appropriation bill hearings, 1944, pp. 729, 730, 732.)

Admiral Land says that he will follow the law surely, now let us see if he does. On May 15, 1943, Admiral Land appeared before the Deficiency Subcommittee of Appropriations and he is now willing to take the date of September 1939 prescribed by the statute and interpreted by the Comptroller General, but he wants to add 35 percent for the taxpayers to pay in addition to the legal value described by the statute. Admiral Land said this:

There have been a great many hours spent in a great many conferences and we have

urged using September 1939 as a base, and adding 35 percent to reflect the average enhancement of wholesale commodities since that date.

Then Admiral Land attempts to jump away from the September 1939 date and take the May 1941 date and he says:

Another possibility would be to take any date between September 1939 and May 1941, which, by indexes of ship costs, ship construction costs, and ship sales, might be a logical and proper date to determine these valuations.

Unless the Comptroller General stands by the law, the Treasury will be looted to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars.

When Admiral Land repeats there is a constitutional question concerning section 902 and related sections of the Merchant Marine Act, I must observe:

First, it is none of the Commission's business to challenge the constitutionality of that act, either in whole or in part—the Commission's duty is to enforce the law as it finds it, and leave constitutional questions to the court.

Secondly, these matters have been considered by the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in connection with the Waterman Steamship Corporation case; and I am informed that Chairman BLAND, of that committee, has been advised by respective authority that there is no serious constitutional question involved; and that section 902 and its related sections of the act are constitutional in all respects.

Now let us see who the Maritime Commission is dealing with when it requisitions ships. It is dealing for the most part with a group of shipowners that bought their ships for \$5 a ton or 3 percent of their construction costs and in a great majority of instances for about \$10 a ton or 10 percent of their construction cost. In the meantime they received an indirect mail contract subsidy which paid them profits for making available ships for carrying mail on a mileage basis. It would be perfectly possible for a ship to get paid \$15,000 to carry one or two letters to China.

The Black committee report in 1935 frowned upon the mail contracts. They were canceled. The act provided direct subsidies to encourage a merchant fleet for the United States that could be used in time of war or imminence of war as a naval auxiliary. The 1936 act provided specific subsidies to equalize American cost of construction, operation, and insurance with the low operating cost, low construction cost, low insurance cost, and other subsidies provided by competing foreign nations.

Admiral Land, when he requisitions ships, is dealing with operators who, according to the authority in public records, I find have received \$280,000,000 worth of subsidies, as follows:

1. Forty-three million dollars: Operating subsidies. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1464, March 2, 1943.)
2. Eighty-five million dollars: Tax forgiveness on subsidies. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1464, March 2, 1943.)
3. One hundred and sixty million dollars: Construction subsidies. (U. S. Maritime Commission report to Congress for period ending October 25, 1941.)

It is well to bear in mind that under the law, construction subsidies were limited to 33 1/3 percent except where the Commission possessed convincing evidence of a higher differential. Starting from the second contract let and without any indication of any convincing evidence possessed by the Commission, the construction subsidies have averaged from 45 percent, and most of the construction subsidies, especially in the last few years, have been a flat 50 percent, irrespective of the fact that Admiral Land has stated that no person could secure delivery of a ship in the last 3 years from any foreign nation.

Authority: Independent offices appropriation hearings, 1944, page 757, House Document No. 840, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session.

On page 713 of the independent offices hearings for 1944, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH was examining Mr. Dirsch, of the Maritime Commission, and I quote from the testimony:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That covers all ships under construction?

Mr. DIRSCH. As of October 31, 1942.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. And the bulk of them are 50 percent?

Admiral LAND. They are. (Independent offices appropriation hearings, 1944, p. 713.)

Continued looting of the Treasury for the benefit of those who are well acquainted with how to secure funds from the Maritime Commission is evidenced from a citation taken from page 756 of the independent offices appropriation hearings for 1944 which reads as follows:

Notwithstanding the fact that competition of foreign shipyards virtually ceased with the beginning of the war in Europe, the Maritime Commission continued to pay construction differentials as high as 50 percent on ships built in American yards. In some cases Italian and Danish shipyards were used in estimating foreign costs, even after Italy was in the war herself and Denmark was in the hands of Hitler. (Independent offices appropriation hearings, p. 756. A part of letter from Senator GEORGE AIKEN to Senator DAVID WALSH.)

This citation indicates that Chairman Land was authorizing the payment of 50 percent which is not mandatory, it is permitted; then he admits as follows—May 15, 1940:

The situation in Europe today is such that there could be no assurance whatever that a ship presently contracted for would be delivered to the party of the original construction contract. (Independent offices appropriation hearings, 1944, p. 757. Portion of letter written by Admiral Land to Hon. S. O. BLAND.)

Yet several months later, on July 17, 1941, Capt. Howard L. Vickery, a member of the Maritime Commission, testified before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in explanation of the reason why a 50-percent subsidy was then being paid for the construction of ships in American yards, that "We had convincing evidence." (Independent offices appropriation hearings, 1944, p. 757. Letter from Senator AIKEN to Senator WALSH.)

The fortunes of war have brought another duty upon the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration. Private insurance companies will not insure the cargo during wartime at rates that are practical and so the Mari-

time Commission is issuing war risk insurance contracts to these same private subsidized operators. On December 24, 1942, I inquired of the Maritime Commission the amount of insurance carried on the steamship *President Coolidge* that had been reported sunk just a few days before by the daily press. I asked Admiral Land for the book value, the cost of improvements, the depreciation, and the amount of insurance.

On January 5, 1943, I received a reply from Admiral Land which to me was shocking and I assume this represents the general policy of the value of insurance contracts on subsidized ships with subsidized owners. The letter has been reprinted in the independent offices hearings for 1944 at page 721 and shows that insurance is issued for 100 percent in excess of the legal value of the ship.

With reference to this subject of values, I insert at this point in my remarks a history of the steamship *Wakefield*, formerly the *Manhattan*, and the steamship *President Coolidge*, which clearly indicates the trend of insurance by the Maritime Commission.

Steamship *Manhattan*, renamed the steamship *Wakefield*. Post office reports on mail contracts show a total construction cost of some \$10,660,000. The hearings on H. R. 5130 show an estimated differential subsidy of \$3,550,000, leaving an estimated cost to the owner of some \$7,100,000.

I can find no evidence of improvement cost.

This vessel, based on the legal 5 percent depreciation, over a period of 10 years, left the ship with a value of some three and one-half million dollars. A suit has recently been filed in the Federal court on this value of three and one-half million dollars wherein the owners ask for \$10,000,000 which apparently was the insurance coverage they carried on this ship. Strange to relate and for some unknown reason, the papers in this case have been impounded. Surely there is no military or naval secret in the fact that suit has been instituted to recover insurance. The public press brazenly publicized the loss of the ship. The only reason for impounding the papers or for secrecy is for an inside deal to rob the Treasury of \$10,000,000 or thereabouts on a value of some \$3,000,000.

With reference to the apparent indifference of the Comptroller General it is my understanding that only recently the Comptroller General has reported to the Congress that on five vessels sold by the United States Shipping Board in 1930 for \$150,000, which ships were later reconditioned and had, as of the time they were taken over by the Maritime Commission, a value of some \$5,000,000. The Maritime Commission paid some \$7,000,000. It is my understanding that the Comptroller General has reported to Congress that this payment of \$7,000,000 was \$2,000,000 in excess of the depreciated value, \$2,000,000 in excess of the book value, some \$2,000,000 in excess of that value at which the ships could be taken over and yet for reasons best known to himself, the Comptroller General states that he has not asked for the return of this money which he admits was a payment of \$2,000,000 of the taxpayers'

money in excess of the authority which the Maritime Commission had, or has, according to his own statement.

Mr. Speaker, I am not only alarmed; I am discouraged that the Congress does not have the facilities to get a broad, comprehensive picture of the reasons for the inflated insurance contracts, the reasons for the dilly-dallying by Admiral Land over the value to be paid to ship-owners for ships requisitioned and ships chartered in the face of the positive terms of the statute and the rulings by the Comptroller General. I am discouraged that the Comptroller General has not given to this Congress a comprehensive picture of the entire transactions of the Maritime Commission during this war and immediately before the war, which, to my way of thinking, is costing the taxpayers of this country hundreds of millions of dollars in excess of his rulings and what the law permits.

I do not think the public will be discriminating and blame Emory S. Land alone—I think it will look to the Congress of the United States as an aider and abettor if they are fleeced out of millions of dollars, and further than that, I think the soldiers, when they come back, will point their fingers with scorn at the Congress which permitted this kind of transaction.

I remind you again that both of these administrators, Stettinius and Land, are presently popular with the Congress, but I warn you that when expenditure of public funds are made unwisely, when there is inefficiency and waste in the conduct of the war under their administration, then and there friendship should cease in the name of the boys who are baring their breasts for the country at the sixty-odd battle fronts of the world and who will pay the cost of this war on their return.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to pursue the matter further just as much as the limited manpower at my command will permit to draft a bill of particulars that will condemn these agencies as the money wasters and tax-spenders they are.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

JULY 4, 1943.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, by way of prelude let me say that I have been a little distressed over the fact that the greatest holiday on the American calendar has gone unobserved in this Chamber.

Sunday was freedom's birthday.

Stout-hearted men said that we should be free.

They said it was a right.

They did something about it.

They made freedom come true.

They invoked the blessings of Divine Providence.

They pledged lives, fortunes, and honor.

There is their measure of freedom's worth.

PERSONAL STRUGGLE

Freedom became a personal issue.

Eighteen times they used the pronoun "he" in the Declaration.

They were referring to the King.

The Declaration is their remonstrance against an individual and his advisers.

THEIR GRIEVANCES SEEM FAMILIAR

Some of their grievances have a fresh and familiar ring.

He refused to approve laws to establish judicial powers.

Short days ago we sought the enactment of the Walter-Logan bill.

He has erected a multitude of offices. Behold today's bureaucracy.

He sent swarms of officers to harass the people.

Ponder the controls of today. They ate out the people's substance.

Behold our own revenues and expenditures.

He altered the powers of government. What of the present effort by the Congress to restore balanced government.

There is a strange familiarity about those grievances.

WHO WERE THESE SIGNERS?

Who were the signers of freedom's charter?

They referred to themselves as representatives of the United States of America in general Congress assembled.

Freedom was the work of a Congress. It points a course for this Congress and these to come.

Preservation of that freedom must be our star and compass.

NATURE OF THE DOCUMENT

What is the nature of this document of freedom?

It was a document of dissatisfaction. The signers were dissatisfied.

The people were dissatisfied. That dissatisfaction is the motive power of human progress.

We must proclaim our dissatisfaction where freedom is menaced.

We must do more. It must be translated into action.

It must be directed to the objective of freedom.

A DOCUMENT OF CHANGE

It was a document of change. One thinks of poor, foolish Gibbon, the historian.

What a great historian he was with a wealth of perspective.

Yet, but a few years before, he proclaimed that the day of upheaval and change had passed.

Yet here was the greatest of upheavals. This, too, is a time of upheaval and change.

Change is eternal. And every change must be in the direction of more freedom, not less.

In today's world, the virus of control threatens freedom.

In today's world the dignity and future of man is being measured in terms of governmental control.

We must not abandon freedom and democracy.

We must go back to it. That, too, requires change.

A DOCUMENT OF YOUTH

It is a document of young men and by young men.

It embodies the courage and resolution of youth.

Jefferson penned this epic at the age of 32.

Carter was 39 and Carroll 38.

Wilson was 33 and Stone 32.

The vigorous scrawl of Hancock was that of a man at 38.

Gerry was but 38.

Consider Lynch of South Carolina at 26 and Heyward at 29.

All life was before them and those lives were forfeit.

There is the yardstick of courage.

A DOCUMENT OF COMMON MEN

The signers were common folks.

Bartlett was a doctor and Harrison a farmer.

Morton was a surveyor and Witherspoon a preacher.

Sherman was once a shoemaker and Clymer a merchant.

Franklin was a printer and Sam Adams a brewer.

Merchants, doctors, lawyers, printers, surveyors, farmers, shoemakers, iron-makers they were.

Not only representatives of the people but representative of the people.

Every Congress since that day has been of the people.

This Congress is of the people.

IT IS A POSITIVE DOCUMENT

It is a positive document.

There is no mincing or equivocation. Strongly did they state their beliefs on freedom as a right.

Strongly did they indict the abuses of the King.

Strongly did they present their patience.

Strongly did they state what they proposed to do.

Strongly, tenaciously did they do it.

The fruit of their strength is a great land.

Deep and abiding must be our gratitude for their strength.

Strong must be our determination to preserve what they wrought.

Strong and bold must be our remonstrance against any menace to freedom.

IT CONTAINS NOTHING NEW

We are told that freedom's charter contains nothing new.

We are told that it but summarizes current thinking and writing.

We are told that its truths were uttered long before by Locke and Rousseau, by Hobbes and Spinoza, by Dickinson and Otis.

What a fortunate circumstance.

It but proves that freedom is no new invention or new contrivance.

It is as old as the yearnings and strivings of mankind.

It needed but reaffirmation and the courage to make it real.

That somewhat lightens the task for today.

We need but redeclare an ancient truth, unwithered by age and untarnished by time.

But it requires some courage and it requires some determination.

FREEDOM IS IN ISSUE TODAY

Freedom is in issue today.

It is freedom under law versus freedom under administrative fiat.

It is freedom under law versus freedom under unchecked, uncontrolled, unbalanced government.

It is freedom of man in all his divine dignity versus that kind of synthetic freedom that is planned by those who embrace the collective philosophy.

They did something about freedom long ago. They did it in Congress.

What do we propose to do about it?

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak any more today, but I do want to call the attention of this House and the Congress to what I said this afternoon. Our boys are dying from hunger and are subjected to slavery and to disease in the camps of Germany and Japan. We are taking their men in safe convoys from the European countries, bringing them here and curing them of disease. We are giving them proper food and nourishment; then we send them out in the country to a camp where they play ball and see movies. My colleague from Michigan stated a little while ago in answer to my speech this afternoon that we ought to treat them fine, in fact treat them better. How can we reconcile the treatment of the American captured soldiers with the men that we have brought here from the European countries, whom we have treated so royally? In fact, as I said, they can play baseball, they can see moving pictures, and do what they like. I am told also they do a little farming and we even pay them for that. I think it is about 75 cents or a dollar a day. By the time we get through exchanging soldiers, as pointed out, we will have nothing to our credit at all.

There has been testimony before my committee in executive session to the effect that some of our civilian Americans were captured by the Japanese and were hungry for days. Some courageous Chinese people had to smuggle in food to feed the American civilians who were held as prisoners by Japan. If we are treating these aliens, these enemies of ours, so well, we ought to try to make an exchange before it is too late.

It was not my purpose to discuss these questions. They are unpleasant. The fact of the matter is the American people ought to know the great expense we are put to in bringing these prisoners of war in here, giving them everything they ask for, including safe convoy, while our boys are dying from disease and hunger. Something ought to be done, whether it is through the Red Cross or some other channel in order to make this exchange at the earliest possible moment while we will have soldiers to exchange.

I want to point out to this House also something in answer to a criticism by my colleague from Michigan. He probably did it in good faith. I said that we now have a group of enemy aliens held at Ellis Island, which is one of our seaports, and these aliens have been there more than a year. Ellis Island has good grounds, good fresh air, and is surrounded by water. If there are enemy aliens there we ought to separate them and put them where they belong—that is, in some

concentration camp—so they do not contaminate the other prisoners who are aliens and were brought in there under the mere suspicion of being enemy aliens. We ought to be able to segregate the good and bad aliens and put them where they belong. In order to keep the American people safe we ought to take these enemy aliens and isolate them and at the same time we should protect those other aliens who are in this country and who are ready to fight and die for this country if given an opportunity to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an address by Colonel Carey, a distinguished engineer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a statement prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the speech I made earlier in the afternoon I may have permission to insert therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE TIMOTHY T. ANSBERRY

Mr. CLEVELER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVELER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELER. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce the passing of Hon. Timothy T. Ansberry, former Member of this body.

Mr. Ansberry served in the Sixtieth, Sixty-first, Sixty-second, and Sixty-third Congresses. He was born in Defiance, Ohio, on December 24, 1871, was graduated from Notre Dame University in June 1893, and he represented the Fifth District of Ohio, the district I have the honor to represent. He was a militant, old-fashioned Democrat.

The death of Timothy T. Ansberry, Member of the House from the Fifth Ohio District from 1907 to 1915, in Doctors Hospital in New York City was announced last night by his son, T. Peter Ansberry. He made his home at 2139 Wyoming Avenue NW.

The son said Mr. Ansberry died of a heart condition that followed an operation. Mr. Ansberry, a Democrat, was a

member of the Ways and Means Committee while in Congress.

He had been in retirement for some time, but for several years had practiced law in Washington, with offices at 1029 Vermont Avenue NW.

Mr. Ansberry was born in Defiance, Ohio, where he was educated in the public schools, and received a law degree from Notre Dame University in 1893. He began the practice of law that year and was justice of the peace from 1893 to 1895 and was prosecuting attorney of Defiance County from 1895 to 1903.

Mr. Ansberry resigned from the House to accept an associate judgeship of the Ohio Court of Appeals, but resigned from that post in 1916 to move back to Washington.

He was a Presidential elector from Ohio in 1916 and a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1920, 1924, and 1928.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair. The bells will be rung 15 minutes before the House reassembles.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5:58 o'clock p. m.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JULY 6, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs.

E. C. GATHINGS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted. There was no objection.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. DANAHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amend-

ments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 113 and 119 to the foregoing bill.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 147) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to increase its borrowing power, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would not consent to the joint resolution being sent to conference, but I would be willing to accede to the gentleman's request if he will modify it by asking that we take the joint resolution from the table and consider the Senate amendments at this time.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution which I sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 292), as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 147, with Senate amendments thereto, be and the same hereby is taken from the Speaker's table, the Senate amendments disagreed to, and the conference requested by the Senate agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment to the resolution adopted by the Senate is to strike from the resolution a provision amending the Federal Reserve Act. The second amendment relates to the matter of grade labeling, which seems to have been acceptable to everybody in the Senate and officials of the Government who are especially interested. That leaves before us one other amendment of the Senate which I will read to the House in order that the matter may be fully understood. This is the language of that amendment:

Whenever a maximum price or prices shall have been established for any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 or of the act entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price

Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," approved October 2, 1942, no subsidy or other payments shall be made either directly or indirectly to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity for the purpose of compensating any such producer, processor, manufacturer, or other person in whole or in part for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation or from any funds authorized to be borrowed by such Corporation or any other Government agency including Government-owned corporations, unless the Congress, by appropriation or otherwise, shall have authorized the use of such funds for such purpose. The definition of the term "person" in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, shall apply to the term "person" as used herein.

Members of the House, after the reading of this amendment, will understand its meaning. Members are familiar with the recent message of the Chief Executive dealing with the recent proposal to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It is felt by the conferees who represented the House in the conference on the other bill that this measure should be sent to conference in order that we may be given an opportunity to work out some solution of the problem in controversy.

Let me say that the amendment to this resolution was adopted on the floor of the Senate under very unusual circumstances. It makes no provision for carrying out obligations that have been made and that have accrued down to this time in connection with the administration of this particular phase of the Price Control Act. The conferees, I am sure, will undertake in good faith to work out some solution of this problem that will meet the views of the House if the bill is sent to conference.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, we have a not unusual situation before us. I know that it is tiresome to talk about this subsidy program any more. The issues are pretty clear. I do not think there is anyone in the House who is any more opposed to the payment of subsidies than I. I do think, however, that the orderly procedure is to send this bill to conference. I say that for several reasons. If we were to accept immediately the Senate version of this bill, in the face of the dispute which has been going on here for weeks about it, we would be charged with acting not finally on the measure, but we would be charged with acting upon the measure without giving due consideration to the language of the Senate bill. There are very few of us who know what the Senate has provided for in the bill, but it does seem to me that the language in the Senate bill is much more rigid than the language in the bill which the President has vetoed.

I think we should have an opportunity to study this out in conference and to report back to this House the result of the conference which we will have on the question and have at least 1 hour of debate on whether the House should ac-

cept the Senate language or any modification of it which we agree upon.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Would not the gentleman be willing for this to go over until tomorrow morning, so that the Members of the House might have an opportunity in the meantime to study the Senate amendments?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say to the gentleman that I do not have any jurisdiction over the matter before the House tonight, which is whether we will suspend the rules and send the bill to conference. I do not think I would be in favor of the gentleman's suggestion, for this reason: We are anxious to recess this House when these controversial matters are out of the way. If we send this bill to conference tonight, as it is hoped we will, we will then be able to work on this either tonight or tomorrow morning and report this matter back to the House and save at least 1 full day. If we do not send this bill to conference tonight, if we send it to conference tomorrow, then the gentleman knows much better than I do that under the rules of the House we cannot take it up until the following day. So I think the proper thing to do is to send this bill to conference now.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Would not a half day be a small matter when so vital a national interest is concerned? The Members have not had opportunity to see the amendment. We are asked to vote in a very arbitrary way on suspension of the rules, a very unusual procedure on a matter we have had no opportunity to study.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further. It is a procedure which we have adopted, and it is not nearly as stringent and arbitrary as the gentleman's procedure, which would compel us to accept or vote down immediately the Senate amendments.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Do I understand that in voting on this motion we do not either vote for or against, or commit ourselves for or against, subsidies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is merely to send the bill to conference to try to work out something to adjust the matter?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct, and we will save at least 1 full day.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. We understand if this is sent to conference the conferees will begin to work immediately upon the things contained in these amendments, and come back and report as quickly as they can?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is correct. If we do not send it to conference tonight it will be impossible to take it up, under

the rules of the House, until the following day.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the resolution?

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. GAMBLE.

HOURLY MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the war agencies appropriation bill and the last deficiency bill will have a report ready early in the morning. I therefore ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

WAR AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL AND SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on the war agencies appropriation bill and the second deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. TROUTMAN (at the request of Mr. SCOTT), indefinitely, on account of death of father.

To Mr. MALONEY, for the balance of the week, on account of urgent business reasons.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 35. An act to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States; and

S. 1252. An act to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relat-

ing to water conservation and utilization projects.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Gertrude Ricketts;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Frank Borah;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of El Paso Electric Co.;

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of George Henry Bartole and Vernon Wayne Tennyson;

H. R. 1397. An act to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument;

H. R. 1557. An act for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert N. Bickert;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld;

H. R. 1940. An act prescribing the salary for the Commissioner of Public Roads and the Commissioner of Public Buildings;

H. R. 1991. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year;

H. R. 2047. An act to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden;

H. R. 2088. An act for the relief of John Rhoden;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Jennie Walker;

H. R. 2527. An act to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes;

H. R. 2663. An act to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities;

H. R. 2683. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943; and

H. R. 3020. An act to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 7, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, July 7, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect Naval

petroleum reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

555. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, to provide additional safeguards for the protection of explosives and ingredients thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

556. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the information which has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for his use in determining the number of employees required by this Department during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

557. A letter from the Chairman, Smaller War Plants Corporation, transmitting information concerning their personnel for the ensuing quarter, as required by Circular No. 421 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated May 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 243. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Roads, as a whole or by subcommittees, to investigate the Federal road system, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 669). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 281. Resolution authorizing a study by the Committee on the Public Lands of certain public-land problems and the use of public lands in rehabilitation of veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 670). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 3140. A bill to provide for the orderly disposition of surplus lands and buildings, and fixtures and facilities appurtenant thereto, and surplus war plants, owned by the United States and by corporations owned or controlled by the United States, which were acquired or constructed for use in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 3141. A bill relating to the appointment and retirement in the Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States of persons with physical disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANCOCK:

H. R. 3142. A bill to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3143. A bill to restore one of the "four freedoms," the freedom of expression; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3144. A bill to incorporate the World War Veterans of the United States Merchant Marine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 3145. A bill authorizing the construction of a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters in the North Slough in Coos County for the purpose of reclaiming land for farming; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 3146. A bill to provide for a temporary diversion by the Sanitary District of Chicago of an additional amount of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system or watershed in order to protect the health of war workers, members of the armed forces, and other persons living in and near Chicago; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 3147. A bill to authorize the equitable adjustment of the wages and salaries of employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 3148. A bill authorizing the appointment of additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3149. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3150. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3151. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from Francisco A. Reyes, President of San Salvador, presenting to the people and Government of the United States sincere congratulations on the occasion of the glorious anniversary of its political emancipation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 3152. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cicero B. Hunt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCGREGOR:

H. R. 3153. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 3154. A bill granting a pension to Fred W. Cron; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 3155. A bill for the relief of Mary Magdalene Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3156. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Anton Seles; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 3157. A bill for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3158. A bill for the relief of P. B. Hume; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 3159. A bill granting an increase of pension to Malinda J. Conwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1936. By Mr. LANE: Resolution adopted by the Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1937. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Conference of Mayors and other municipal officials of the State of New York, thirty-fifth annual conference, urging the abolition of the policy of discrimination against urban streets and highways in the distribution of Federal highway revenues and substitute therefor a fair and just system of allocating highway revenues based upon actual traffic needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1938. By Mr. KENNEDY: Resolution of the Conference of Mayors and other municipal officials of the State of New York, thirty-fifth annual conference, urging the abolition of the policy of discrimination against urban streets and highways in the distribution of Federal highway revenues and substitute therefor a fair and just system of allocating highway revenues based upon actual traffic needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1939. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of 78 residents of Toledo, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1940. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. Ralph Suter and 34 citizens of South English, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1941. Also, petition of Eleanor M. Clark and 20 citizens of Ontario, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1942. Also, petition of Menno D. Rempel and 13 citizens of Coquille, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1943. Also, petition of G. J. Eckermann and 21 citizens of Pueblo, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1944. Also, petition of Mrs. D. W. Cowles and 20 citizens of Orwell, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1945. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles Torsberg and 40 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and

speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1946. Also, petition of Priscilla E. Faries and 61 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1947. Also, petition of Laura Shifler and 68 citizens of Boonsboro, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1948. Also, petition of W. W. Fridy and 39 citizens of Lyman, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1949. Also, petition of Faye R. Troth and 96 citizens of Peoria, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1950. Also, petition of L. A. Engler and 149 citizens of Puyallup, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1951. Also, petition of F. L. Duncan and 117 citizens of Flat Rock, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1952. Also, petition of 11 citizens of Winnetka, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1953. Also, petition of Lois B. Hedges and 64 citizens of Spring Valley, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1954. Also, petition of Mrs. Walter Royal Jones and 339 citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or trans-

portation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1955. Also, petition of Ruth E. Stahn and 103 citizens of Ketchikan, Alaska, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1956. Also, petition of Julia M. Martin and 65 citizens of Snohomish, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1957. Also, petition of Pearl A. Lewis and 20 citizens of Ashville, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1958. Also, petition of Mrs. Gaynell Protts and 76 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1959. Also, petition of Byron E. Horn and 137 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1960. By Mr. McCOWEN: Petition of 430 citizens of Pike, Highland, and Scioto Counties, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1961. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of Mrs. C. B. Penland, of Sulphur Springs, Ark., and others, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1962. Also, petition of J. A. Pearce, of Conway, Ark., and others, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1963. Also, petition of Mrs. Wellington Robbins, of Conway, Ark., and others, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1964. Also, petition of Rev. J. W. Hendrickson, of Conway, Ark., and others, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1965. Also, petition of Mrs. W. R. Stapleton, of Conway, Ark., and others, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1966. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, regarding social security and old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.